



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



**600100453J**



ISM

urches.





# THE CHURCH CATECHISM

EXPLAINED AND ANNOTATED

PRINCIPALLY AS AN

Aid to the Clergy in Catechizing in Churches.

## PART II. THE CREED.

BY

THE REV. H. STRETTON, M.A., OXON.,

PRINCIPAL OF THE ENGLISH AND FOREIGN COLLEGE, HIGHGATE;  
JOINT COMPILER OF THE "VISITATIO INFIRMORUM;"  
AUTHOR OF "THE ACTS OF S. MARY MAGDALENE," "THE GUIDE TO THE  
SICK," AND OTHER WORKS.

LONDON:  
JOSEPH MASTERS, ALDERSGATE STREET,  
AND NEW BOND STREET.

MDCCLXIV.

138. d. 479

"The most cursory inspection of this work will show that it was never in the Author's idea to furnish a stereotyped form of questioning and answering, to be used in churches by the clergyman and children. Those who are in the slightest degree skilled in the valuable and highly important art of catechizing, know how absolutely necessary it is that questions should be put in the easiest and most familiar language, and that all close reasoning should be broken up into the simplest elements of thought. But to produce this simplicity, either the book must be extravagantly large, or, if of moderate dimensions, an incomplete and jejune exposition.

"The author would, therefore, wish this work to be regarded as a manual or text-book; not as calculated to supersede the necessity of thought on the part of him who questions, and those who answer, but as containing a connected series of suggestions and heads of thought, duly arranged, by which a clergyman may, to use the words of Archdeacon Bather, 'first instruct his pupils, by questioning the meaning into them, and then examine them by questioning it out of them.'"*—Extract from Preface to Part I.*  
*p. vii.*

THE  
CHURCH CATECHISM

EXPLAINED AND ANNOTATED PRINCIPALLY AS AN AID  
TO THE CLERGY IN CATECHIZING IN CHURCHES.

---

CHAPTER VI.

THE CREED. INTRODUCTION. USE. DIVISIONS.

266. *Question.* What are the Articles of the Faith called?

*Answer.* 1. The Belief or the Creed. 2. The Symbol.

267. Q. What is the meaning of the word "Creed?"

A. "The Faith" of the Church of CHRIST, from the Latin Credo, I believe.

268. Q. What was the general meaning of the word *σύμβολον* (*sumbolon*)?

A. It expressed a sign, mark, privy token, or watchword, by which the soldiers of one camp were known from their enemies of another.

269. Q. Show then how the word symbol is applied to the Christian's confession of his faith.

*A.* By another's declaration of his faith in the words of the Creed, and *his right use* of it, he knows the friend of truth from the enemy of the faith.

*Illustration.*—As an enemy sometimes gets possession of the pass-word, so with the Creed. We must prove that those who allege its words in defence of doctrine, are true men by their orthodox interpretation of it according to the other creeds and formularies of the Church.

A symbolical instance of this is in the enemy's possession of the pass-word, Judg. xii. 6, and its detection. Hence the use of the word "Shibboleth."

270. *Q.* How many Articles of the Faith are there?

*A.* Twelve.

271. Repeat the Creed, observing the necessary divisions.

*A.* 1. I believe in GOD the FATHER Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth :

2. And in JESUS CHRIST His only SON our LORD,

3. Who was conceived by the HOLY GHOST, born of the Virgin Mary,

4. Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried ;

5. He descended into hell ; the third day He rose again from the dead ;

6. He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of GOD the FATHER Almighty ;

7. From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

8. I believe in the **HOLY GHOST**;
9. The Holy Catholic Church ; the Communion of saints ;
10. The forgiveness of sins ;
11. The resurrection of the body, and
12. The life everlasting.

272. *Q.* You are directed in the Catechism to *rehearse* the Articles of your belief, and in several services of the Church you are also constantly required publicly to *rehearse* them : what is the object of this ?

- A.* 1. That we may do honour to Almighty God by a *public* confession of our Faith. S. Matt. v. 15, 16.
2. Because public confession of our faith is necessary to salvation. S. Matt. x. 32, 33 ; S. Luke ix. 26 ; Rom. x. 10.

*Illustration.*—The practice of martyrs in the loss of their lives, and confessors in the sacrifice of their possessions, &c., for Divine truth, a testimony to the necessity of public confession.

3. That we may remind ourselves of our belief, and by force of habit strengthen ourselves in its maintenance.

*Illustration.*—Erroneous opinions and maxims when constantly published acquire the force insensibly of recognised sentiments, and pass into settled habits of thought and action. In like manner we habituate ourselves, in the constant use of the Creed and of the **LORD'S** Prayer, to the thought of **GOD** as the **Holy Trinity**, as the Source of creation and redemption, and the Giver of all gifts and graces.



**600100453J**





2ndly. That I believe in His *unity*. He is one only God, and has therefore alone of all beings the right to claim any worship and adoration. (See Eph. iv. 6, also 5th verse; *one God*, implying one faith and worship.)

3rdly. That in this Unity is a Trinity of Divine Persons, since "I believe in God" is applicable to each Person of the Trinity, Whom I declare in the three divisions of the Creed to be FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST.

279. Q. What is the benefit and necessity of our belief that there is a God?

A. 1. It is the foundation of religion, without which it is impossible to be built up in our most holy faith.

2. A firm belief will strengthen us in the faith of the promises and threats of God. Gen. xxxix. 9.

280. Q. You say that you believe the existence of a Divine Being: show that there must of necessity be an All-powerful Creator and LORD of the universe.

A. 1. From the order of causes; for of every effect there must be a cause, until we come to the first and universal cause of all things. (Beveridge.)

*Illustration.*—Ex nihilo nihil fit. So a footprint on sand implies a cause.

2. The Holy Scripture directs us to the most convincing proof of this, the proof from the marks of design and invention in the creation. "His eternal power and Godhead," as S. Paul urges, "are clearly seen by the things which are made." Rom. i. 20.

*Illustration.*—Paley's Argument, ch. i., Natural Theology. So the ingenuity and invention displayed in a watch argues the existence of a maker. Now we should think a man very absurd and unreasonable who should declare, after examining the mechanism of a watch, that it came by chance. And yet some have wished it to be believed because insects seemed to rise simultaneously from a dung-heap, that these which were much more wonderful than watches, were the offspring of chance. Our reason or common sense obliges us to apply the relation of the watch to its maker to Creation. Instances of design and power are everywhere visible. How fearfully and wonderfully we ourselves are made (Ps. cxxxix. 14); what variety of parts, limbs, and growth. Again, we find a great proof of design in the fact, that man should have been made to live in all countries, but certain of the animal race only in particular climates, some in one, some in another.

281. Q. What is the Scripture testimony that this Divine Being is one?

A. Scripture (the inspiration and authority of which is explained at p. 43, &c.) everywhere asserts the existence of a Divine Being. "I am the **LORD**, and there is none else; there is no **GOD** besides Me." Isa. xlv. 5, 6. "We know that there is none other **GOD** but one." 1 Cor. viii. 4; S. Mark xii. 29; Eph. iv. 6.

282. Q. What is the proof in the nature of things that there is but *one* **LORD** over the visible creation?

A. The proof from its uniformity, that it is all

formed, governed, and preserved by one master mind.

2. From an appearance of contrariety and diversity of plan and operation, we argue confusion and discord, and *vice versa*, in an army, &c. So observing regularity of seasons, return of sun, moon, and stars in their courses, the sea kept within its bounds, we argue unity of a Divine Being.

*Illustration.*—From a different view of nature, &c., the heathens argued a plurality of Gods; Neptune contending against Jupiter, &c. *Contra Ps. cvii. 23 and following verses; lxxxix. 6, 9.*

283. Q. But is there not one awful being who exercises great control over the earth?

A. Yes, Satan, who would be as God, but whose movements are all overruled. *Job i.*

284. Q. There might be systems where the GOD of this visible creation might not rule: what is to be urged against this view?

A. 1. That there would be no guarantee for the uniform state of things in an universe in which Gods of diverse power and dominion were existing, *self-dependent*. The design of one would clash with that of another. Worlds would in their orbits, as sent forth in space from different Divine Beings, come into collision and crush one another.

2. Baxter's argument, from the necessity of a First Cause: "Man did not make himself, neither animals nor plants. If the souls of men have a maker, the spirits next above them must have a

maker, and so on until you come to a First Cause That was made by none."—*Baxter*.

Secker's argument. There must be a GOD the First Cause.

The oldest of us, but a few years ago, was not. How came we then to be? From our parents. But could they form a mind with all its faculties? No more than a tree knows how to make the seed that grows into a like tree.

But if our parents could have created a mind, and been the cause of our being, still they must have had a cause of theirs, and so on to our first parents. And some superior mind must have created theirs.

3. GOD could not be comprehensible, i.e. could be embraced by no compression, infinite, all-powerful.

4. Miracles and prophecy. Ps. xliv. 1 ; lxxii. 18.

5. Universal consent even of Pagans.—*Barrow*.

285. Q. Has not the doctrine of two eternal beings been taught, viz., one good, the other evil?

A. This was the fundamental absurdity of Manichæism, the assertion of an evil and a good divinity, independent the one of the other.

*Note.*—Manichæism once very prevalent. The great S. Augustine was a Manichæan, but converted to the faith by the prayers of his mother and the teaching of S. Ambrose.

286. Q. Is it not difficult to believe in a Trinity of Divine Persons?

A. No : for 1st, there is nothing in the belief of the Trinity that calls upon us to contradict reason, or which is contrary to analogy.

*Explanation.*—We are taught to believe in three Divine Persons of one will and power, not in three persons of different wills, power, and other attributes. We are not called upon in this to believe what is contradictory, as that bread is no longer bread, &c.

2ndly. There is much in nature which leads us to expect a Trinity; there being triads on all sides of us.

*Illustration.*—As fire is heat, light and the fire the substance which emits both, and is yet distinct from both; as also in colours, there being three primitive colours—blue, red, and yellow. In looking at a rainbow, we see seven different colours, and for a long time it was thought that the number was really seven, but of late years it was found that there are not more than three. These three are called primitive or primary colours; the others are called secondary colours, because they are made up by a mixture or combination of the first three. (In the above examples, and in those that follow from Sewell's "Christian Morals," it should be remembered that they are adduced not by way of proof, but of analogy.)

You cannot, says Plato, have the idea of one thing without the notion of three things also; the thing itself, another thing which is not it, and a third thing between them, for if there were nothing between, they would be one, not two. Neither can you see two things and something between them, that is, see in the whole three things without conceiving of them as one, for the third thing connects and binds together the two extremes.—*Christian Morals*, 319.

Every form or figure implies at least two lines

and a space between them. Every law also implies at least three things,—one body to act, another to be acted on, and the change which takes place in consequence. It is a general law that heat melts ice, and cold hardens water. Here is the heat, *one*; the ice, *two*; and the liquefaction, or form into which the ice is thrown by the action of the heat, *three*. The cold, *one*; the water, *two*; and the hard form which the water assumes, *three*. Arsenic, *one*; a living body, *two*; and the death which takes place on their union, *three*. *Sewell's Christian Morals*, 312.

3rdly. Our sense of God's distance from His creatures seems to point out that we might expect that He would have co-equals of the same substance with whom to communicate and take counsel. Why should we, His creatures, presume to think that communion and fellowship were alone necessary to *our* nature, and that God must be in a state of isolation from all communion?

287. Q. Have mankind evinced a tendency to believe in a Triune God?

A. Very obscurely, if at all; the supposed traces bearing reference rather to such narratives as those of Cain, Abel, and Seth; or Shem, Ham, and Japhet. The Trinity is essentially a doctrine of Revelation.

288. Q. Mention several scriptural instances in which our belief in the Holy Trinity, or a plurality of the persons of the Godhead is more or less comprised.

A. 1. Let us make man. Gen. i. 26.

2. The man is become as one of us. Gen. iii. 22.

*Note.*—For refutation of argument used against these, see D'Oyly and Mant: i.e., sovereigns use “us,” but they never use “one of us.” The plural pronoun was however a form of speech introduced by monarchs of a much later period.

3. Destruction of Sodom. The three men to Abraham and Lot. The **LORD** rained fire from the **LORD**. Gen. xix. 24.

4. The blessing of the priest in a Triune **LORD**. Num. vi. 23—27.

5. And one cried unto another and said, Holy, holy, holy is the **LORD** of Hosts, the whole earth is full of His glory. Isa. vi. 3.

Also I heard the voice of the **LORD** saying, Who will go for *us*? Isa. vi. 8.

6. In the beginning was the Word, &c. S. John i.

7. Baptism of our Saviour.

8. Commission of baptism. S. Matt. xxviii. 19.

9. The benediction. 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

10. The Three Witnesses. 1 S. John v. 7.

11. The **HOLY GHOST** mentioned as **GOD**—the **FATHER** and **SON** by themselves. Eph. v. 20.

289. Q. Has the Church of **CHRIST** maintained this doctrine?

A. Yes, in every kind of form, &c., &c. Holy, holy, holy, in Te Deum, &c. Glory be, &c.

290. Q. With some persons the belief of a Trinity is made to be the belief and worship of three **GODS** or Tritheism. What is the most practical answer to such an assertion?

A. That those who worship the Trinity have

not the slightest consciousness of their being worshippers of any but one GOD.

291. Q. What, for instance, is the practical effect of the worship of the Trinity upon you? Do you ever feel as if you had been worshipping more than one GOD?

A. Not in the least. I have none other than the most sublime notion of God's unity in my worship of Him.

292. Q. What do you mean when you say, "I believe in the FATHER?"

A. First and principally that He is the FATHER of His only SON begotten before the worlds. S. John i. 18.

2ndly. That He is the FATHER of Him, as He is JESUS CHRIST conceived by the HOLY GHOST, and born into the world. S. Matt. i. 18—20; S. Luke i. 32; iii. 21, 22; S. Matt. iii. 17.

293. Q. How is the correctness of this answer recognised in the catechism?

A. In the question and answer following the Creed. I am taught there to say, First I learn to believe in GOD the FATHER. 2ndly, In GOD the SON, thus manifesting the relation meant by the FATHER.

294. Q. Is GOD the FATHER of any one besides His Ever Blessed SON?

A. Yes, He is the FATHER of every person baptized into CHRIST JESUS, who are all called sons of GOD as His brethren. Eph. iv. 5—7.

295. Q. Then by what law is CHRIST JESUS the Only Begotten SON?

*A.* By the law of generation. (See preceding part of Catechism Explained. Q. 106.)

296. *Q.* And by what law is GOD the FATHER of JESUS CHRIST in His human nature?

*A.* By adoption. S. Luke iii. 21, 22; S. Matt. iii. 17.

297. *Q.* Explain the nature of this law of generation by an example.

*A.* As we are the proper sons of our own parents, and bear their nature, so is our blessed LORD the true and only begotten SON of the FATHER, bearing His nature and substance.

298. *Q.* By what law are we the sons of GOD?

*A.* First, by adoption. Eph. i. 3—6. By being, for CHRIST's sake, adopted by the FATHER as His children, but more especially by

2ndly. Regeneration (Tit. iii. 5), or the new birth, or incorporation into the Body of CHRIST.

299. *Q.* Explain how you are regenerate, or born again, as that work belongs to CHRIST JESUS.

*A.* By taking flesh of our nature, JESUS CHRIST became the SON of GOD, and by being made members of Him through the HOLY SPIRIT we become His brethren, and consequently the children of GOD. S. John xx. 17.

300. *Q.* Is there any lower way in which men may be called the sons of GOD?

*A.* By creation; as inventors and authors of anything are said to be the fathers of their invention. So Tubal Cain, Jubal and Jabal. Gen. iv. 20, 21. Preservation, &c. Job xxix. 16; 1 Tim. i. 2.

301. *Q.* What practical lesson should be learnt from this Article?

**A.** The awful reverence which is due to Him. Mal. i. 6. Filial trust. S. Matt. vii. 11. Endurance of chastening. Heb. xii. 9.

302. **Q.** What do you understand by "Almighty?"

**A.** That the divine attribute of all-mighty ness is to be ascribed to God.

303. **Q.** What do you mean by a divine attribute?

**A.** A characteristic attributed or ascribed to God as held in perfection by Him.

304. **Q.** Into what classes may the divine attributes be divided?

**A.** Natural and moral.

305. **Q.** Mention some of the attributes, and first this, that God is Almighty. What is this termed?

**A.** Omnipotence; God's being all-powerful—Almighty ness. Ps. cxv. 3; cxxxv. 5, 6; Jer. xxxii. 17, 27; S. Matt. xix. 26; S. Luke i. 37.

The fundamental absurdity of Manichæism was its believing in the existence of two eternal beings; but there was no heathen philosopher who did not believe the elements of matter to have existed from all eternity. The second principle or God of the Manichees was not matter nor the material universe, but a being equally spiritual, intelligent, and incorporeal with the other. Though this system represented God as exclusively the author of good, it subjected Him to evil: for He was perpetually exposed to see His own works suffering from evils which He could not prevent. Such a notion entirely destroys the omnipotence of God; inasmuch as it supposes that there is

something in existence which He wishes not to exist, and yet which He cannot destroy.—*Burton's Christian Church*, 366, 7.

306. Q. What two-fold use do you know of this term Almighty?

A. 1. That God is all-powerful.

2. That God's dominion is over all things. Dan. iv. 35; 1 Tim. vi. 15; Rev. xvii. 14; xix. 16; Ps. cxxxv. 5.

307. Q. When we say that God is Almighty, do we mean that He can do what is contradictory?

A. That He is not able to commit sin, or to do anything contrary to the law of His own being, or to the eternal principles connected with it, is nothing derogatory to His Almighty power. (God is not a man that He should lie. Num. xxiii. 19; Heb. vi. 18.)

308. Q. Mention some other of the attributes of God.

A. 1. Ubiquity, or God's being everywhere Omnipresent. Ps. cxxxix. 7—9; Jer. xxiii. 24.

2. Universal vision, God's seeing everywhere, all-seeing. Ps. cxxxix. 2; Jer. xxiii. 23, 24.

3. Omniscience, God's knowing all things. (Jer. xxxii. 19; Rom. xi. 33,) which includes fore-knowledge, prescience.

4. Invisible. (1 Tim. vi. 6; S. John i. 18.)

5. Infinite, without bounds. In Athanasian Creed "incomprehensible," (1 Kings viii. 27; Jer. xxiii. 24,) meaning that His being and perfection have no limits or measure, but incomprehensibly comprehend all place and beings. *Baxter.*

6. Eternity, God's being everlasting. 1 Tim. i. 17; Rom. i. 20; Ex. xv. 18; Deut. xxxiii. 27.

If there were a time when there was no God, there was a time when there was nothing, and then there never would have been *anything*, for of nothing can come nothing.

7. Immortality. 1 Tim. vi. 16; i. 17.

309. Q. What are God's moral attributes?

A. 1. Immutability. S. James i. 17; Heb. vi. 13, 17, 18.

2. Mercy. Ps. ciii. 8; cxxxvi.

3. Justice. Shall not the God of all the world do right? Gen. xviii. 25.

310. Q. What Psalms illustrate the glory of God by the works of the natural universe?

A. Psalms viii. 1—3, xix. 1, civ.

311. Q. Let us endeavour from a few considerations of God's natural works to arrive at some faint notion of His Almighty power. What is the size and shape of this earth?

A. The diameter 7,900 miles at the poles, 7,926 miles at the equator, circumference 25,000 miles.

312. Q. On what does it rest?

A. It rests on nothing, or is self-sustained.

313. Q. How then is it supported?

A. By the power of God in its appointed path through the heavens.

314. Q. Can this be explained?

A. By the power of the sun's attraction and by the centrifugal and centripetal forces.

315. Q. If it is sustained by the sun's attraction, at what distance is the sun?

*A.* 95,000,000 miles.

316. *Q.* What is the size of the sun?

*A.* Its diameter 882,000 miles, about  $111\frac{1}{2}$  times that of the earth, (*Keith*), and nearly four times the distance of the moon from the earth, 240,000. (*Sullivan*.)

317. *Q.* What illustration can you give of the size of the earth?

*A.* 40,000 landscapes of 250 miles in circumference would require nine years to view it in the most rapid manner. *Dick's Christian Philosophy*, 52, 53.

318. *Q.* And this is only a portion of the wonders of what is called the Planetary System, but there are several millions of stars which are not connected with our planetary system. What are these?

*A.* They are believed by astronomers to be distinct suns, with each its own attendant planet.

319. *Q.* And at how great a distance is the nearest fixed star?

*A.* The dog-star, or Sirius, the nearest fixed star is 400,000 times the distance from the sun which our earth is. A cannon ball would take nine millions of years to reach it. Light that reaches the earth from the sun in eight minutes, would require three years to come from Sirius.

320. *Q.* Is the creation attributed in Scripture to any other Person of the Trinity than God the FATHER?

*A.* Yes, to God the SON. S. John i. 3, 10; Col. i. 16; Heb. i. 2.

321. *Q.* Why is God the FATHER said to be

the Maker of heaven and earth, when the worlds, in the beginning of S. John, are said to be made by the Word of God?

*A.* 1. God the FATHER created as willing and designing that creation which by God the SON is carried into execution.

2. Because the Word or the SON of God is the instrument by Whom the FATHER doeth all things; yet the proper work of the FATHER is creation, as redemption is the proper work of the SON.

322. *Q.* What do you understand by heaven and earth?

*A.* All matter; everything that is made: everything visible and invisible.

323. *Q.* Why was not the word "world or universe" used?

*A.* Because the Hebrews had no word corresponding with it in their language.

324. *Q.* Mention some texts where this expression is used.

*A.* Gen. i. 1; Jer. xxiii. 24. S. Paul uses both "world" and "heaven and earth." Acts xvii. 24.

More fully still Rev. x. 6, Col. i. 16, and therefore not only the material and sensible world (the matter of which the world is made), but all Angels, spirits, &c., the material world, and all the things in it, even the most eminent, so as to exclude no being, to the very highest potentate short of the Deity Himself. There is therefore no room for an independent origin of evil.

The dwelling-place of the Angels, the heaven of heavens, with all their hosts, Neh. ix. 6, dis-

tinguished from the firmament, the heaven of heavens, ver. 9. S. Paul's third heaven. 2 Cor. xii. 2; Ps. ciii. 20, 21. Sons of GOD. Job ii. 1; xxxviii. 7.

Certain of them kept not their first estate. See Hooker, Bk. i. c. iv.

325. Q. How did GOD make all these?

A. (Wake, 30.) After two different manners. Some He produced by an immediate creation as—

1. The Angels.
1. { 2. The spirits of men.  
3. Primæval matter. Gen. i. 1.

2. The visible world out of antecedent matter. Gen. i.

326. Q. Did GOD produce the world by any labour and with the help of any instruments?

A. "He spake, and it was done: He commanded, and it stood fast."

327. Q. Why did GOD make the world? May we not ask, Can a man be profitable to GOD? Job xxii. 2; Ps. xv. 2.

A. GOD was perfectly happy, rich in all perfection, completely full; therefore it was only that His natural benignity and munificence incited Him to this great action of communicating existence. It is because goodness is of itself communicative. 1 S. John iv. 8, 16; Ps. xxxiii. 5; cxix. 64; cxiv. 9.

328. Q. What sentiments and actions should the belief of this Article beget in us?

A. 1. It should induce us to admire and adore GOD's exceeding wisdom and glory in so vast a

work as creation. Ps. cxiv. 10, 11; civ. 24. A part of worship. Neh. ix. 5, 6; Rev. iv. 10, 11.

2. It should beget in us gratitude and love towards GOD. Ps. viii. 4, 9: For I will consider Thy heavens, &c.

3. Humility. See Pearson. Ps. viii. 3.

4. Hope and trust. Ps. cxxi. 2; cxxiv. 8; cxlv. 5.

5. Obedience. Ps. cxix. 73.

329. Q. We confess then that GOD made the world, does He preserve it?

A. Heb. i. 3; S. Matt. vi. 26, 28—30; x. 29, 30.

330. Q. Could we not discover these things from nature and reason?

A. Yes, Scripture itself says so (Rom. i. 20); but the fuller revelation of all things concerning GOD is set forth in Holy Scripture.

*Art. II. And in Jesus Christ, His only Son our Lord.*

331. Q. What is the second division of our belief?

A. And in JESUS CHRIST His only SON our LORD, &c.

332. Q. By what relations is our SAVIOUR here described?

A. By His Person, His offices, His relations to GOD and to ourselves.—Wake, 32.

333. Q. What was His Name and its meaning, and when appointed?

A. Jesus, meaning SAVIOUR. It was an-

nounced, 1st. To the Blessed Virgin. S. Luke i. 31. 2ndly. To S. Joseph. S. Matt. i. 21.

334. Q. What is the exaltation and high significance of this name?

A. Acts iv. 12; Phil. ii. 9, 10.

Other persons in Holy Scripture called Jesus. Acts vii. 45. Joshua called Jesus by S. Stephen. Heb. iv. 8. Jesus, son of Sirach. Joshua the High Priest, Bar-Jesus. The name not unfrequent.

335. Q. In what sense was Joshua so called?

A. In that he was a Saviour, or Deliverer.

*Moses*, as typical of our SAVIOUR's redemption from sin and death, delivered the Israelites by bringing them through the Red Sea and the wilderness.

*Joshua*, as typical of our SAVIOUR's bringing us into the presence of GOD and there assigning our mansions to us, delivered them by bringing them into the promised land of Canaan and dividing to the tribes their inheritance.

\* *Jesus CHRIST* our SAVIOUR fulfils in Himself both types. As also that of the Judges, who are said to be Saviours. Judges iii. 9, 15; Neh. ix. 27. (See Pearson, who shows that Joshua was the most express type of our SAVIOUR.)

336. Q. What is said concerning the obligation of bowing to the Name of JESUS and confessing it?

A. That at the Name of JESUS every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that JESUS CHRIST is

**LORD**, to the glory of **GOD** the **FATHER**. Phil. ii. 10, 11.

337. *Q.* Do we then base our practice of bowing at this Name on this text?

*A.* No: since our practice of bowing the head in Divine Service at the Name of **JESUS** is enjoined as a distinct ecclesiastical ordinance, and for a specific reason, by Canon XVIII.

*Explanation.*—The text declares what all, whether things on earth or things in heaven, should do, *viz.*, bow the knee; and what all, whether good or evil, will one day be forced to do, worship the Holy **JESUS**, signifying indeed generally that He should be worshipped, but without respect to place. Bowing the knee means that persons generally were to pray to **CHRIST JESUS**; our practice of bowing the head is more express. A Canon or rule of the Church would scarcely be made to enjoin what Scripture had *explicitly* ordered.

*Canon XVIII.*—“And when in time of Divine Service the **LORD JESUS** shall be mentioned, *due and lowly reverence* shall be done by all persons present as it hath been accustomed, testifying by these outward ceremonies and gestures their due acknowledgment that the **LORD JESUS CHRIST**, the true eternal **SON** of **GOD**, is the only **SAVIOUR** of the world.”

338. *Q.* Then what do you understand to be the purport of the Canon?

*A.* It provides that we should show our reverence at the mention of the Name of **JESUS** in token that we believe Him to be **GOD**, the **SAVIOUR** of the world.

339. *Q.* Why is this special reverence not also paid as commonly at the mention of GOD the FATHER?

*A.* Because as GOD there is no question of His Divinity or right of receiving worship: but at the mention of the Name of JESUS CHRIST, He being both GOD and Man, and JESUS being His Name as Man, common to others also as well as to Him, it is requisite that some special acknowledgment of His Godhead should then be made.

340. *Q.* What is the meaning of the word CHRIST?

*A.* Anointed (Christos. Greek); the same word as Messias (Syriac).

341. *Q.* Do we bow at the Name of CHRIST?

*A.* Not when our LORD is spoken of as CHRIST; for then we speak of Him as He is the Anointed Prophet, Priest and King, offices which imply His Divine nature.—Hook's Church Dictionary.

342. *Q.* Why was JESUS called CHRIST?

*A.* To fulfil prophecy. It was prophesied of Him that He was to be the Messias or the Anointed. Dan. ix. 25, 26; S. John i. 41.

343. *Q.* Were there any types of Him in this character?

*A.* Several. The prophets, priests and kings who were anointed with holy oil.

344. *Q.* But our SAVIOUR was not anointed with holy oil?

*A.* He was anointed with the HOLY GHOST, which was the reality, of which the holy oil was only a type. S. Matt. iii. 13; Acts x. 38; Ps.

**xlv. 7. Anointed with the oil of gladness above His fellows.**

The olive's fatness alleged as honouring God and man. Judges ix. 9. The tabernacle and temple, &c., anointed with oil. Oil mixed up in sacrifices. So priests. Exod. xl. 15; 1 Kings xix. 16.

**345. Q. How do we know from the fulfilment of Prophet, Priest and King in the Person of JESUS, that He was the true CHRIST?**

*A. Because the characters of Prophet, Priest and King were never united in any one person but in Him.*

**346. Q. Explain this in the instances of Samuel, Melchizedek, and David.**

*A. Samuel, a prophet and a priest, but not a king.*

**Melchizedek, a king and a priest, but not a prophet.**

**David, a king and a prophet, but not a priest.**

**347. Q. In what manner are we to look upon Him as exercising His prophetic office?**

*A. Not so much as He foretold things to come, but as He declared to us GOD's will. Compare Isa. lxi. 1 with S. Luke iv. 18; so Deut. xviii. 15.*

**348. Q. What remarkable prophecies however did He utter?**

*A. His Death and Resurrection, the fall of Jerusalem, the perpetuity of His Church, the final Judgment.*

**349. Q. How did He become a priest to us?**

*A. By offering a vicarious sacrifice, becoming*

a Mediator for us, and interceding for us at the right hand of GOD. Heb. iii. 1 ; vii. 24, 25.

350. *Q.* What sacrifice did our SAVIOUR offer ?

*A.* Heb. ix. 26. The sacrifice of Himself.

351. *Q.* How did the Israelites foreshow the sacrifice of CHRIST ?

*A.* By the blood of bulls, goats, and lambs.

352. *Q.* And how does the Christian Church show it forth until the end ?

*A.* By the commemorative sacrifice of the Body and Blood of CHRIST in the Bread and Wine.

353. *Q.* In what way is our SAVIOUR our king ?

*A.* He rules over us, although ascended into heaven. (See Part I. p. 26. S. Matt. xxviii. 18, 20 ; Ps. ii. 2 ; Acts v. 31.)

*His Only Son our Lord.*

354. *Q.* What is the meaning of Only SON ?

*A.* His Only Son is more fully explained in the Nicene Creed by the words " His Only Begotten SON."

355. *Q.* What is the meaning of Only Begotten Son ?

*A.* His Only SON by generation. (See also Part I. pp. 18, 21. S. John iii. 16 ; v. 26 ; Ps. ii. 7 ; Heb. i. 5.)

356. *Q.* Why does this Article follow next ?

*A.* Because the belief of the Messias or CHRIST was held in necessary conjunction with the belief of His being the Only SON of GOD.

357. *Q.* And did the Jews before CHRIST's coming so receive it?

*A.* It was always believed by the Jews, though they now deny it, that the Sonship followed as a natural consequence upon the Messiahship.

358. *Q.* How is this shown?

*A.* We have found the Messias, said Andrew to his brother, and the next day Philip and Nathanael were seeking Him, and Nathanael confesses, Rabbi, Thou art the SON of GOD, Thou art the King of Israel. S. John i. 49. So S. John xi. 27; S. Matt. xxvi. 63; S. John xx. 31.

359. *Q.* In what Psalm did the Jews appropriate to the Messiah the title of SON of GOD?

*A.* The Second Psalm.

360. *Q.* How did the primitive Christians include this title of Son with His other names in the compass of one word?

*A.* In the word *ἰχθύς* (*ichthus*), each of whose letters is the initial of one of the sacred titles of our SAVIOUR. *Ιησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτήρ.* Iesous Christos Theou Uios Soter.

*Note.*—Tertullian has, *Nos pisciculi secundum ἰχθύν nostrum Jesum Christum in aqua nascimur.*—Tertul. de Bapt. cap. i.

361. *Q.* How did you say is the expression Only SON rendered in the Nicene Creed?

*A.* The Only-Begotten SON of GOD, Begotten of His FATHER.

362. *Q.* Where is this expression used in Scripture?

*A.* By S. John, iii. 16. *μονογενὴς, monogenes.*

363. Q. What are the first four foundations of our SAVIOUR's sonship ?

A. 1st. By generation. Because He was by the Spirit of GOD born of the Virgin Mary. S. Matt. i. 20 ; S. Luke i. 35.

2ndly. By consecration and commission. S. John x. 34—36.

3rdly. By resurrection as the First-born. Because raised out of the earth unto immortal life. Acts xiii. 33 ; Rom. i. 4 ; Col. i. 18.

4thly. By actual possession as heir of all. After resurrection made heir of all things in His FATHER's house. Heb. i. 3—5.

364. Q. But these are not the only or the strongest grounds of our Blessed LORD's sonship ?

A. No : these only arise out of His humanity ; whereas His generation is eternal. These would constitute Him a right to the title of SON of GOD, but not to the description of the Only-Begotten SON of GOD.

365. Q. What are the proofs of a far higher generation ?

A. 1st. That He had a real existence before He was conceived in the Virgin.

2ndly. That the being which He had antecedently to His conception was not any created being but was essentially Divine.

3rdly. That the Divine essence which He had He received as communicated to Him by the FATHER.

4thly. This communication of the Divine nature is a proper generation.

5thly. The Divine essence was never commu-

nicated in that manner to any person but to Him.

366. *Q.* What are the texts which show CHRIST's pre-existence before conception?

*A.* The first are to show that He came down from heaven before He went up. S. John vi. 62; also 33 compared with 51: also 32 compared with 38: S. John iii. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 47: and Eph. iv. 9; which passage refers not to CHRIST's descent into the grave, but to His coming upon earth.

367. *Q.* And now show to what extent the doctrine of this pre-existence must be understood.

*A.* 1. S. John the Baptist testifies that He is of greater dignity than himself, because He was before him. S. John i. 15, 30.

2. Our SAVIOUR declares to the Jews, S. John viii. 58, that He was before Abraham; meaning, Before ever Abraham was born I had a real being and existence (by which I was capable of the sight of him), in which I have continued until now. (See Pearson on the expression *I am*.)

368. *Q.* Did the Jews understand Him in this sense?

*A.* Yes; they understood His answer as pertinent to their question, but blasphemous, and therefore took up stones to cast at Him.

369. *Q.* How is the pre-existence of CHRIST proved long before Abraham's time?

*A.* CHRIST preached to them that lived before the flood. 1 S. Pet. iii. 18—20.

370. *Q.* And cannot you carry the doctrine of His pre-existence still higher than this?

*A.* The Scriptures show that CHRIST made the

world, and consequently had a real being at the beginning of it. Heb. i. 2; xi. 3; i. 8, 10—12; Col. i. 14 compared with 15—17.

371. Q. To whom do all the first writers of the Church of God understand "Let us make man" to be addressed?

A. To the SON.

372. Q. What other passages distinctly prove the Divinity of the SON?

A. S. John i. 1—3.

373. Q. Did the Jews understand the use of the Word Logos as the Church of CHRIST does?

A. Pearson, p. 215. Gen. i. 3; Ps. xxxiii. 6; Heb. xi. 3; 2 S. Pet. iii. 5.

374. Q. What sect opposed the doctrine of the pre-existence of the SON?

A. The Photinians led by Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium, who was condemned by a council held in the same city.

*Note.*—They all agreed suddenly in the condemnation of him, Arians, Semi-Arians, and Catholics. He was six times condemned and twice deposed, and indeed was so generally condemned, as S. Jerome notifies, that his opinion was soon worn out of the world.

He taught that God was one and alone, and to be confessed after the manner of the Jews. He denies the fulness of the Trinity, and does not think that there is any Person of God the Word, or any of the HOLY SPIRIT. He affirms that CHRIST was a mere man, whose beginning was from Mary; and this he taught in every form that we ought to worship the Person alone of

**GOD the FATHER, and CHRIST alone as man.—**  
(Vincent. Lir. cap. 17.)

375. **Q.** What are the texts which show that the being which CHRIST had before He was conceived by the Virgin was not any created but the Divine essence?

**A.** Heb. iii. 4; S. John i. 4, 5.

376. **Q.** What is the argument built upon the last?

**A.** He could not be the same God with Him any other way, than by having the same Divine essence.

377. **Q.** Consult Phil. ii. 6, 7, and consider what further argument is used from the incompatibility of that which is finite with infinite?

**A.** He Who thought Himself to be equal (Phil. ii. 6, 7) with God must of necessity be truly and essentially God, because there can be no equality between the Divine essence, which is infinite, and any other whatsoever, which must be finite.

378. **Q.** Is not an argument to be adduced from His being called Alpha and Omega?

**A.** Yes; when Isaiah is compared with S. John these terms are found to be applied with equal propriety to God the FATHER and to God the SON. Isa. xli. 4; xlvi. 12; xliv. 6; Rev. i. 11, 17, &c.

379. **Q.** Is our SAVIOUR in the Scriptures called God in such a manner as by that name no other can be understood but the one only and eternal God?

**A.** Yes. It is said there are Gods many, but as it can be proved that CHRIST is none of these,

but is clearly distinguished from them, then He can be no other than that one. 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6.

380. *Q.* In explaining the mystery of godliness, what great passage does S. Paul bring forward?

*A.* 1 Tim. iii. 16, in which GOD, Who is the subject of each proposition, must be understood of CHRIST.

381. *Q.* From what other texts may we conclude that our SAVIOUR is the true GOD?

*A.* Acts xx. 18, where the Church of GOD must mean only the Church of CHRIST. It could not refer to the HOLY GHOST, for the HOLY GHOST did not purchase the Church with His Blood. Consider also at S. Matt. i. 23, the use of the term Emmanuel.

382. *Q.* What does Bishop Pearson say on the passage, S. John xx. 28?<sup>1</sup>

*A.* He first remarks that CHRIST's Name has here the Greek article prefixed to it required by the adversaries of His Divinity.

Consider also the use of the Greek Article. 1 S. John v. 20; Acts x. 36.

Consider Rom. ix. 5, where the Article is omitted.

And secondly he exclaims, alluding to S. Thomas's confession, "Let Him be the LORD of me, and the GOD of me, Who was the LORD and the GOD of an Apostle."

<sup>1</sup> In the questions on this Article, it will be seen that most liberal use has been made of Bishop Pearson's work on the Creed.

383. *Q.* And who was the great disturber of the peace of the Church on the doctrine of the SON's Divinity?

*A.* Arius, who put forth the doctrine that CHRIST, though called GOD and admitted to be the highest of created intelligences, was not of the same Divine essence as GOD the FATHER.

384. *Q.* Give some account of him.

*A.* See 1st Part, p. 53.

385. *Q.* What great council was held whose decrees effectually, after a long struggle, had the effect of suppressing Arianism?

*A.* See 1st Part, p. 53.

386. *Q.* In what terms did the Nicene Council anathematise the doctrine of Arius?

*A.* Those who said that there was a time when He was not, and that He was not before He was born, or that He is another substance or created, those the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematised.

*Note.*—Some heretics attributed only humanity to CHRIST, and declared that He did not exist before His birth of the Virgin Mary, as Theodosius followed by Artemon, and a Bishop of the name of Natalius. Burton, 259—261. So also Paul of Samosata, 360, and Photinus, already mentioned.

*Q.* 374.

Others held, as Arius, that He was endowed with a portion of Divinity. Arius advanced this doctrine to the highest point short of the truth, and hence his scheme seemed to be more in accordance with the Scriptures than any other system, and was proportionably successful.

387. Q. State at greater length what were the doctrines of Arius.

A. The doctrine of Arius was that the SON sprang not from the nature of the FATHER, but was created from nothing; that He had an existence even before time, but not from eternity. He is therefore in essence different from the FATHER, and is in the order of creatures, Whom however He precedes in excellence, as GOD created all things by His instrumentality, whence He was called the SON of GOD, the Logos or Word of GOD. As a creature the SON is perfect, and as like to the FATHER as a creature can be to the Creator. But as He has received all things as a gift, from the power of the FATHER, as there was a period in which He was not, so there is an infinite distinction between Him and the nature of the FATHER. Although He is called GOD, He is not so in truth, but was deified in that sense in which men who have attained to a high degree of sanctity, may arrive at a participation of the Divine prerogative. Maimbourg. Hook's Church Dict.

388. Q. But did not such tenets attack the very soul of the great doctrines of redemption and salvation by the Blood of CHRIST?

A. Yes, for according to this doctrine it was not GOD made man, but a changeable nature, who effected the great work of the redemption of fallen man.

389. Q. And you mean that this doctrine could give no comfort or assurance to fallen man?

A. No, for he saw that his Redeemer was as

infinitely removed from the essence of GOD as himself, (Maimbourg,) and that consequently an arm less than Divine must be too short to save.

390. Q. Who was the great defender of the faith in the controversy?

A. S. Athanasius, first a Deacon, afterwards a Bishop in the Church of Alexandria. (See 1st Part, p. 52.) Neale, i. 142. In all the disputes in the Council of Nicaea he signalized himself as the most powerful champion against the Eusebians, (Semi-Arians,) and thereby attracted that implacable hatred on their part, which ceased not to pursue him to the end of his days.

391. Q. Give some account of the state of popular feeling on this great question.

A. Neale, i. 136, says, The contemporary Fathers give a lively picture of the popular interest and fearful irreverence displayed on the question. On asking for the necessities of life in an inn, in the booth, at the shop of the baker or that of the shoemaker, the inquirer, instead of receiving the reply he expected, was met with the answer, "Great is the Only-Begotten, but greater is He That begot."

392. Q. What expressions would the Arians accept in the declaration by the Council of the SON'S Divinity?

A. They objected not to the declarations, "The Word is GOD," "The SON is the Virtue, the Wisdom, the Eternal Image of the FATHER; like Him in all things, immutable, eternally subsistent in Him;" or even "He is very GOD."

393. Q. At what point was it that they stopped

in the searching investigation instituted by the Council?

**A.** The Council proposing to leave no room for subterfuge, said, The SON of GOD is CONSUBSTANTIAL with the FATHER. And here the Arians would not follow. They would not affirm that He is not only similar (homoi-ousion) but inseparable, not only like but the same (homo-ousion).

394. Q. Who had employed this word first?

**A.** A letter from Eusebius of Nicomedia was read before the Council, in which he said that "if it be asserted that JESUS CHRIST is Very and Uncreated SON of GOD, it is almost the same thing as asserting that He is consubstantial with the FATHER." The letter was torn in pieces by the Council in token of abhorrence, but the Fathers adopted the word as only certainly expressive of the full Divinity of CHRIST.

395. Q. What passage of the Old Testament plainly asserts that GOD always had a SON?

**A.** "Who hath established all the ends of the earth? What is His Name? and what is His SON's Name?" Prov. xxx. 4.

396. Q. Whose object was it to deny this truth, and why?

**A.** Mahomet's. See Pearson, 244, 245. It was the chief design of Mahomet to deny this truth, because he knew it was not otherwise possible to prefer himself before our SAVIOUR. One prophet may be greater than another, and Mahomet might persuade his credulous disciples that he was greater than any of the sons of men; but while any one

was believed to be the Eternal SON of GOD, he knew it was impossible to prefer himself before Him.

397. *Q.* What in the condition of the Christians of the East is supposed to have greatly facilitated the conquests of Mahomet?

*A.* Disputing the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, they in effect either worshipped a plurality of Gods, or acknowledged as inferior deities JESUS CHRIST and the HOLY GHOST, and so the more easily yielded to a system like Mahomet's, which while it had for its object the suppression of polytheism and the establishment of the Divine Unity, yet admitted the mission of CHRIST.

*Note.*—Pearson in a note says: “Mahomet gave command to worship one only GOD, and to honour CHRIST as the Word of GOD, but not as His SON:” and mentions the ridiculous history that CHRIST, after His Ascension into heaven, was accused by GOD for calling Himself His SON, and that He denied it, as being so named only by men without any authority from Him.

398. *Q.* In what manner do we become sons of GOD?

*A.* By our Baptism we are made brethren of CHRIST. He is the First born among many brethren. Rom. viii. 29. “Go to My brethren, and say unto them, that I ascend unto My FATHER and your FATHER.”

399. *Q.* In what way is CHRIST implied to be GOD when He is said to be the Only-Begotten SON of GOD?

*A.* Because the word “begotten” betokens

equality of nature agreeably with the admitted principle that what is born of man is man, i.e. the son of a father is equal to him as being born of the same substance. What is born essentially or begotten of God must be God. Phil. ii. 6; Heb. i. 6. Hence "image of God," "express image of His person." 2 Cor. iv. 4; Heb. i. 3.

*Illustration.*—A SON in the Deity signifies not another substance. If the sun be said to beget its own light it is not another substance.—Nicene Creed. Pearson, 245, 246. The ground on which we contend that every man is originally free-born, is that he is of one common parent and partaker of the same substance.

400. Q. In what way is the SON second to the FATHER?

A. Not in nature, but in order.

401. Q. How is this distinction shown?

A. This distinction is shown in the fact that the SON is begotten of the FATHER. So also shown in the fact that the HOLY GHOST proceedeth from the FATHER and the SON. Again, God sent His Only SON into the world,—sent His SON to be the propitiation for our sins. (1 S. John iv. 9, 10.) The SON does not send the FATHER, but while the FATHER sends the HOLY GHOST, (S. John xiv. 26,) the SON sends the HOLY GHOST, S. John xvi. 7.

402. Q. What Godlike attributes are given to our SAVIOUR in Scripture?

A. Universal creation: Without Him was not anything made that was made. S. John i. 3.

Universal dominion : The FATHER hath given all things to the SON, &c. Omniscience : His disciples declare, unrebuked, their belief that He knows all things. S. John xvi. 30 ; S. Matt. xi. 27 ; S. John i. 18. Absolute disposal of His own life : I lay down My life, &c. S. John x. 18.

*Our Lord.*

403. *Q.* What is the force attached to *Our LORD*?

*A.* *Our* is used to express the peculiar relation which He bears to us as Christians, He by His precious Blood having made us His purchased possession (1 Cor. vi. 20 ; 1 Cor. vii. 23), and obtained a full right of dominion over us. Eph. i. 14.

404. *Q.* Does our **SAVIOUR** anywhere appropriate this title?

*A.* Yes, S. John xiii. 13.

405. *Q.* To what extent is it applicable?

*A.* He is our **LORD** and King. Rom. xiv. 9 ; Eph. i. 20, 21 ; Acts x. 36.

406. *Q.* Was **CHRIST** to be our **LORD** by the prophecies?

*A.* Jer. xxiii. 6. In Scripture the **LORD** printed in capitals is **ЈЕНОВАН**. Isa. ix. 6. Isa. xl. 3, compared with S. Matt. iii. 3. **LORD** is thus an epithet of **GOD**, and the Creed in this way became a clear witness against those who denied the Divinity of **CHRIST**.

407. *Q.* Is He to be worshipped?

*A.* Yes, to be both worshipped and glorified, not only in earth, but in heaven by all rationa-

beings without exception. Phil. ii. 9—11; Heb. i. 6.

408. *Q.* After thus considering the nature of the offices of the SON of GOD, what are we next to reflect upon?

*A.* What our SAVIOUR has done and suffered for us.

*Art. III. Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.*

409. *Q.* What are the words of Scripture on this subject?

*A.* S. Matt. i. 20; S. Luke i. 35; S. Matt. i. 18.

410. *Q.* Was Joseph the real father of CHRIST?

*A.* No, He had no earthly father. S. Luke i. 35. The Holy Thing was to be called the SON of GOD. S. Luke iii. 23. Joseph was the “supposed” father of JESUS.

411. *Q.* Why could not our LORD come on earth like other men, but must be born of a Virgin and conceived by the HOLY GHOST?

*A.* Because if He was in all respects born like other men, He would thus bear the same sinful nature as other men, whereas He was like us in all things sin only except. Heb. iv. 15; vii. 26. See also Wake 43, 8 *Q.*

412. *Q.* What reasons are there for His being incarnate?

*A.* 1. He took our flesh and had our nature, because one in our flesh and of our nature must

pay the penalty of sin done in our nature. Heb. ii. 14, 17, 18 ; iv. 14—16.

2. He can sympathise in our sufferings and feelings, accommodate Himself to all our wants, and impart Himself to us. S. John i. 14, 16.

3. He can in our nature offer a most perfect pattern of all virtues, especially humility. Phil. ii. 5—7.

4. He gave in our flesh a testimony and proof to us of the resurrection of the body.

5. And gave us assurance that the transactions of the Day of Judgment would be impartial and merciful, as conducted by one bearing our flesh and acquainted with our infirmities. Acts xvii. 31.

413. Q. Was it necessary that the **HOLY GHOST** should come upon the Virgin Mary, and that the power of the Highest should overshadow her?

A. Yes, to prevent the flesh which He was assuming from becoming unholy, and to keep it pure from all taint of corruption ; for if He were simply like ourselves He would be unable to save.

414. Q. What was He called in consequence ?

A. *τὸ ἅγιον*, that Holy Thing.

415. Q. What do you understand by the words “He was conceived by the **HOLY GHOST**?”

A. That a body was prepared for **CHRIST** by the **HOLY GHOST**. Heb. x. 5.

416. Q. Can you mention any analogous act performed by the **HOLY GHOST**?

A. The **HOLY GHOST** in like manner brooded over chaos at the creation. He was also present at the formation of the first Adam. This is implied in “Let us make man.” Gen. i. 26.

417. Q. Then are we to account the HOLY GHOST His FATHER also?

A. No: for in His Incarnation He took nothing of the HOLY GHOST. Only the HOLY GHOST took the seed of the Virgin Mary and made it flesh without the help of man or sense of the woman: which flesh, united to the soul, the second Person in the Trinity assumed into His own Person, and became one CHRIST. (Explanatio, &c.)

418. Q. But we are certainly to account JESUS CHRIST as the SON of the FATHER?

A. Yes, GOD Himself being already His FATHER with respect to that Divine Nature which He had from the beginning, became again so in a new sense with respect to His human nature.—Secker, 60.

*Born of the Virgin Mary.*

419. Q. We thus determine the meaning of “conceived by the HOLY GHOST,” now we are to endeavour to understand all that is implied in the words “Born of the Virgin Mary.” This is a very necessary article, is it not?

A. Yes; for without all operation of the Mother, our SAVIOUR would not have been the Son of Man.

420. Q. We declare then by this Article—

A. That the Only Begotten SON was made really and truly man, of the same human nature which is in all other men who by the ordinary way of generation are conceived and born.

421. Q. And this is necessary because—

*A.* The Mediator between GOD and Man is the Man CHRIST JESUS (1 Tim. ii. 5) : for since by man came death, by *man* came also the resurrection of the dead.

422. *Q.* And is not this the reason why He is called the Son of Man ?

*A.* Yes, in His human nature He is always promised to us as the Seed of the Woman, Gen. iii. 15 ; the Seed of Abraham, Gen. xxii. 18 ; Gal. iii. 16 ; the Son of Abraham, the Seed of David, Rom. i. 3 ; S. Mat. i. 1 ; Heb. ii. 16, 17 ; it behoved Him to be like unto His brethren, Heb. ii. 14 ; forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same.

423. *Q.* Who taught a contrary doctrine to this in the first ages of the Gospel ?

*A.* The Phantasiasts or Docetæ (from *phantasia*, appearance, and *δοκέω*, to seem), who taught that the Body of JESUS CHRIST was not a real but only an apparent, or at least ethereal body, and that thus He had not really suffered, and that His death was only in appearance.

*Note.*—The Docetæ, or those Gnostics who believed the Body of JESUS to be a phantom, are generally traced to Simon Magus as their founder ; and they were becoming numerous in the latter part of the first century.—*Burton's Lectures*, vol. ii. 59, 60.

Valentinus and Marcion afterwards propagated this heresy. Of the latter Irenæus relates that S. Polycarp was on one occasion met by him and asked for some sign of recognition, but the only

reply which he received was, "I recognize the firstborn of Satan."—*Burton*, vol. ii. 125.

424. Q. What Scripture seems distinctly aimed at this heresy?

A. 1 S. John iv. 2, 3, also S. John i. 14.

425. Q. Did CHRIST have the same flesh as ours? Show from Scripture that He was in effect a real man and not a shadow?

A. Yes, a Body was prepared for Him. Heb. x. 5. He grew in stature and in wisdom. S. Luke ii. 52. He hungered and He ate. S. Luke iv. 2. He slept, groaned in the spirit, was troubled, and wept. S. John xi. 33, 35. Was angry, was in a great agony. S. Luke xxii. 44. Thorns pricked His sacred temples, nails pierced His hands and feet.

*Note.*—Athan. Creed. "Furthermore it is necessary to everlasting salvation, that he also believe rightly the Incarnation of our LORD JESUS CHRIST."

Much depends upon our having true and just sentiments of the Incarnation, in which the whole economy of our salvation is nearly concerned. To corrupt and deprave this doctrine is to defeat and frustrate, in a great measure, the Gospel of CHRIST, which bringeth salvation; wherefore it is of great moment, of everlasting concernment to us, not to be guilty of doing it ourselves, nor to take part with those that do so.—*Waterland*.

426. Q. But does not His Divine nature added to the Human make two CHRISTS?

A. "Who although He be GOD and Man, yet He is not two, but One CHRIST." (Athan. Creed.)

427. *Q.* How does the Athanasian Creed illustrate this?

*A.* "For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one Man, so God and Man is one CHRIST." The (Basilidian) Gnostics maintained that CHRIST was a mere human Being, Who had a Divine Being called CHRIST united to Him. *Bev.* viii.

*Note.*—Another and perhaps less absurd form of Gnosticism was that Jesus had a real body, inasmuch as He was born of human parents, and CHRIST, Who was an emanation from God, was united to Jesus at His baptism. It is probable that the publication of the three first Gospels was instrumental in producing this change; and that the Gnostics who visited Judæa, could not resist the evidence of Jesus having had a real and substantial human body. The first persons who are mentioned as maintaining this form of Gnosticism were Carpocrates and Cerinthus.—*Burton's Lectures*, vol. i. 352.

Irenæus quotes Polycarp as having been heard to say, that John being at Ephesus, and going to bathe, and seeing Cerinthus in the place, hurried out of the bath without bathing, and added, "Let us run away, lest even the bath should fall to pieces, while Cerinthus the enemy of truth is in it." iii. 3, 4, p. 177. Theod. *Hær.* *Fab.* ii. 3, p. 220. Epiph. *Hær.* xxx. 24, p. 148, puts the name of Ebion for Cerinthus.

428. *Q.* Supposing CHRIST had been only man, what would have been the consequence to us?

*A.* Our sins could not have been atoned for, as only He Who is God can do this.

429. Q. Supposing CHRIST had been only GOD, what would have been the consequence?

A. He could not have been received by us so indisputably as our Judge, understanding as He does whereof we are made, and the infirmities of our nature. He could not, as man merely, have paid the penalty of sins done by man.

430. Q. Did not Apollinarius fall into error in endeavouring to account for the one CHRIST?

A. He denied that our LORD possessed a human, reasonable soul, and attempted to make one CHRIST by confounding the two natures in one, and by subjecting the Godhead to change, whereas He did not change His Divine nature, or convert it into Flesh, though He be said to have been made Flesh; He took Flesh upon Him, He assumed human nature, took man into an union with God, and thus was He one CHRIST.—*Waterland*, 266.

*Note.*—Athan. Creed. “One, not by conversion of the Godhead into Flesh, but by taking of the Manhood into God.

“Perfect God and perfect Man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting.”

431. Q. Since JESUS CHRIST is both God and Man, may the Virgin Mary be therefore said to be the Mother of God?

A. She may; because she is the Mother of that Man Who is GOD; “not by confusion of substance, but by unity of Person.” As Abraham is the father of Isaac, though not the father of his soul, so is she the Mother of the Second Per-

son in the Trinity, though not the Mother of His Godhead.

432. *Q.* Who taught that the Blessed Virgin was not to be called the Mother of God?

*A.* Nestorius, who maintained that the Son was two Persons, saying, that He Who inhabited the Temple is one thing, and the Temple which He inhabited another.

433. *Q.* Give some account of him and of his doctrine.

*A.* He was a priest of Antioch, and his asceticism, his solitary life, his decisive and dogmatical manner, and above all, his great power of extempore eloquence, rendered him the admiration of the citizens. He was weak and ambitious, but as much inferior to Arius in power as superior to him in morality. He regarded the orthodox with a great degree of contempt, as magical and superstitious. He received the Emperor's summons to Constantinople, and was consecrated Patriarch, and only five days after, such was his zeal, demolished a church of the Arians. The heresy of which he was the leader took its rise in the following manner. Anastasius, a priest whom he had brought with him to Constantinople, preaching in the presence of Nestorius, asserted that the Blessed Virgin had no right to the title of Mother of God: for, said he, she was a human creature, and Deity cannot be born of humanity. A tumult instantly arose in the church, on which a Bishop, Dorotheus by name, and one of the most intimate friends of Nestorius, rose in his place and said in a loud voice, "If any man affirm Mary to be the

Mother of God, let him be anathema." Nestorius showed by his silence that he approved the new doctrine; and on Christmas day openly stood forward as its favourer. "The FATHER," he said, "begat not of the Virgin an Infant God, the Word; for in the beginning was the Word, as John saith; a creature bore not the Creator, but rather a Man who was the organ of Deity . . . . God was incarnate, but never died, yea, rather elevated Him in Whom He was incarnate. On account of the employer then I venerate the vestment which He employed."—*Neale*.

434. Q. And what were the results on the minds of the people?

A. The greater part of the pious inhabitants of Constantinople abstained from the communion of their Patriarch. In the city a spirit of determined opposition was awakened, beginning with the laity, and threats were heard of casting into the sea one who had now manifested himself to be a wolf in sheep's clothing.—*Neale*.

435. Q. Who were the great opponents of the heresy?

A. S. Proclus, Metropolitan of Cyzicum, who had been put forward for the throne of Constantinople, a man of great eloquence, delivered a magnificent oration before Nestorius on "the Virgin Mother of God." "If God had not been born," he said, "He could not have died; if He had not died, He could not have destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil . . . . In the womb as in a temple, God was made a priest; not changing the nature that He had, but out of

compassion putting on that which is after the order of Melchizedec . . . If the Word had never dwelt in the womb, Flesh could never have ascended the Throne. If God had abhorred to enter the Virgin, it had been an injury to the Angels to minister to man. We speak not of a despised man; we confess an incarnate God. He that is in His essence without a mother, is in the earthly economy of grace without a father; or else, how shall we say with Paul, without father, without mother? If He be purely Man, He is not without a Mother; if He be purely God, He is not without a FATHER; but now He, remaining one and the same is without a mother as the former, and without a father as the formed." Thence Proclus takes occasion to dwell on the debt which human nature owed, and of its utter inability to pay.—*Neale.*

436. Q. What other great champion was raised up to defend the orthodox doctrine?

A. S. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, who in an epistle writes: "Since, then, according to nature He is truly God and King, since we read expressly that they crucified the LORD of Glory, how can we doubt that the Holy Virgin is to be named the Mother of God? Then adore Emmanuel, as truly One, nor after the conjunction once made, again sever Him into two. Then the infatuated Jew will laugh in vain, then will he be manifestly guilty of the Death of the LORD: then he will be convicted of having sinned not against a man like ourselves, but against God the SAVIOUR of all. . . . Then shall the Gentiles in no wise be able

to mock at the Christian faith. They will acknowledge that it is to no mere man that we pay Divine honour; . . . for though He was born as we are, yet He remained that which He was, namely GOD."

*Note.*—This heresy of Nestorius was condemned in the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. Nestorius was deposed.

*Art. IV. Suffered under Pontius Pilate; was Crucified, Dead, and Buried.*

437. Q. Who is this that by the Creed is said to have suffered?

A. JESUS CHRIST, Who is said to be the Only SON of GOD the FATHER, and our LORD.

438. Q. We have already satisfied ourselves, have we not, that He was Himself GOD?

A. Yes; one of the Divine Persons of the HOLY TRINITY.

439. Q. Why then must CHRIST, Who is a Divine Person, suffer?

A. Because, besides having a Divine, He has also a human nature.

440. Q. And what would you thence infer?

A. That having a human nature, He must in that nature be subject to all the infirmities, passions, sensibility to suffering and pain incidental to ourselves. Phil. ii. 7; Heb. iv. 15.

441. Q. Was not this nature even perfected in this manner?

A. Yes. Heb. ii. 10.

442. Q. Is there any special advantage derived

to us from His full possession of our human nature?

*A.* The greatest; for we are assured to our everlasting comfort of His capacity as a human being like ourselves of sympathising in all our sufferings, and of being touched with the feeling of our infirmities.

443. *Q.* What were CHRIST's sufferings before He was crucified, and first during His whole life?

*A.* His whole life was one of suffering and trial: a Man of Sorrows, Isa. liii. 3; birth in a manger, S. Luke ii. 21; designed for slaughter; flight into Egypt, S. Matt. ii. 13; had not where to lay His head, S. Matt. vii. 20; suffered temptation in the wilderness; complained of a faithless and perverse generation, "how long shall I suffer you?"—experienced contradiction of sinners;—opposition and persecution from the rulers of His people.

444. *Q.* And now from the time when He entered upon His Passion?

*A.* Betrayal by Judas; denial by Peter. Physically—scourged; buffeted; spit upon; crowned with thorns; dragged from one tribunal to another; bearing His Cross. Mentally—Agony in the garden to sweating blood; feeling of resentment on His apprehension, "Are ye come out as against a thief?" mocked at; scoffed at.

445. *Q.* Did the Prophets foretel the suffering and sorrows of the Messiah?

*A.* In very plain terms. Isa. liii. 3, 5, 7; Gen. iii. 15; Dan. ix. 25, 26; Ps. xxii. 16, 17.

446. Q. Why is Pontius Pilate named in the Creed?

A. 1. That we may know the time when CHRIST suffered, and that it was none other than that fulness of time (Gal. iv.) foretold by Daniel. ix. 25, 26.

2. That the Scriptures might be fulfilled, Gen. xlix. 10; declaring that the sceptre should not depart from Judah until Shiloh come.

3. To mark the mode of His punishment. He could not have been hung upon a tree by the Jewish mode of punishment under a Roman Governor. Crucifixion was a Roman punishment.

447. Q. Was the LORD JESUS innocent?

A. He was pronounced so even by His judge. S. Matt. xxvii. 24, 26.

448. Q. What rendered the accusation of His persecutors so cuttingly grievous to Him?

A. That He Who was the establisher of a new religion should be accused of blasphemy; and that He Who came to establish a code of morals, and to teach obedience to Cæsar should be accused of rebellion.

449. Q. Why then did Pilate give Him up to the Jews?

A. Because he feared the Jews, who would have reported him to Cæsar as unfaithful, saying, "If thou let this man go thou art not Cæsar's friend."

450. Q. Why was crucifying the manner of CHRIST's death?

A. It was the vilest death, by the Roman law, none but the lowest slaves being put to death by

it, and especially cursed by GOD. Deut. xxi. 23; Gal. iii. 13; also S. John iii. 14; Phil. ii. 8.

451. Q. Were His sufferings shorter than was usually the case with those dying by crucifixion?

A. Yes, owing to extreme bodily and mental anguish before crucifixion, and perhaps from the fineness of His bodily constitution and frame.

452. Q. How did a Greek Litany express His sufferings?

A. "By Thine *unknown* sufferings."

453. Q. Was this special manner of His death the subject of prophecy?

A. Ps. xxii. 16; Zech. xii. 10; S. John xix. 36, 37.

454. Q. Was it only CHRIST's Body that suffered, or also His Soul and Godhead?

A. CHRIST only suffered in His human nature. In His Divine nature He could not suffer. S. Matt. xxvi. 38; S. John xii. 27.

Praxeas taught that the SON and HOLY GHOST were not distinct Persons, but merely modes or operations of the One Being called GOD. Tertullian opposed his doctrine, and showed that it must lead us to believe that the FATHER Himself was born of the Virgin Mary, that He suffered on the Cross, and was Himself JESUS CHRIST. Praxeas's followers were hence called Patriconians. Sabellius followed with the same doctrine, 351.

455. Q. What did CHRIST's soul suffer?

A. It suffered not by any sinful passion, but by natural lawful fear of what He was to undergo.

456. Q. Are not the sufferings of CHRIST spoken of as experienced by GOD?

A. 1 S. John iii. 16; Acts xx. 28. To declare that GOD laid down His life for us and purchased the Church with His Blood, is simply to declare that JESUS CHRIST is GOD.

*Note.—As we believe that GOD redeemed us by His own Blood, so also it hath been the constant language of the Church that GOD died for us.—Pearson.*

457. Q. Did CHRIST suffer the pains of hell which the damned suffer?

A. No, it was impossible that He could suffer those pangs of tormented souls which arise from an evil conscience.

458. Q. What was the purpose of CHRIST's death?

A. "He suffered death upon the Cross that He might make there by His one oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."—*Communion Office.*

"His meritorious cross and passion, whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins and are made partakers of the kingdom of heaven."—*Address for Holy Communion.*

"Who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His FATHER to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men."—*Art. II.*

459. Q. Explain the meaning of the word Sacrifice as applied to CHRIST's death.

A. The sacrifice (*sacrificium*, fr. *sacer*, sacred—

facere, to make) of the death of CHRIST is that oblation or expiatory offering of Himself once (for all, *ἄπαντας*) offered to GOD by JESUS CHRIST His only SON as our *Mediatorial* Priest and *Intercessor*, to be our *Propitiation* to Him both for sins original and natural, whereby His wrath against us was appeased, and He became *reconciled* unto us, having received an atonement covering and paying the penalty of our sins and placing us in a condition of acceptableness with Him, together with a complete *satisfaction* to His insulted justice in the *vicarious sacrifice* of His SON in our stead, by the *ransom* of Whose precious blood-shedding we are redeemed from the bondage of hell and the captivity of Satan.

460. *Q.* In what point of view is the death of CHRIST to be regarded?

*A.* With the Church generally we are to look upon it as a sacrifice for sin, and not as the Socinians, Unitarians, and others regard it, merely as, in its effects, a deliverance; or as the attestation of a holy man to the truth of the precepts taught by him, as, for example, the death of Socrates.

461. *Q.* Now to examine this question fully, we should know something about sacrifices, the extent and duration of the rite, and the character and objects with which it was practised. Tell me, to what extent did the practice proceed, and what you thence infer?

*A.* It was universally practised by the heathen and Jewish nations, and hence we gather the belief that a command so evidently unquestioned

must have been derived from as powerful an authority as the obedience was unlimited, no less than that of GOD Himself.

462. *Q.* What have you to say of its character and objects?

*A.* In heathen sacrifices we find, from classical authors, the most certain indications of their having been appointed to propitiate divinity, and to expiate and atone for sins; and on examination of the sacrifices of Holy Writ we perceive everywhere instances of the same design. Further, the reference of these sacrifices to CHRIST throughout is made obvious by the New Testament. When then we find the sacrificial terms applied to the death of CHRIST and to that redemption wrought out by Him, we conclude that they are to be understood in the same sense. (For illustration and continuation of this important subject, see Appendix to Creed.)

463. *Q.* Was it necessary that CHRIST should become a bloody sacrifice for us?

*A.* It was necessary that CHRIST should die, and by His death perform the sacerdotal office. (Heb. v. 1.) But CHRIST had no other sacrifice to offer for our sins than Himself. (Heb. x. 4, 8, 9.) If He will offer sacrifice for sin He must of necessity die, because without shedding of blood there is no remission. (Heb. ix. 22; 1 S. Pet. i. 18, 19.)

*Note.*—Pearson also shows that CHRIST's death was necessary for the confirmation and completion of His prophetic and regal offices.

464. Q. What should we learn in a practical way from CHRIST's sufferings and crucifixion ?

A. 1. That we should be willing to undergo all suffering patiently that may come upon us. Heb. xii. 2—4.

2. That we should learn, as He voluntarily crucified His flesh for us, so for His sake to crucify our worldly affections and desires. By thus suffering we shall also reign with Him. 2 Tim. ii. 12.

465. Q. For whose sins did CHRIST suffer ?

A. For the sins of the whole world. 1 S. John ii. 2 ; Heb. ii. 9 ; 1 Tim. ii. 6.

466. Q. But all men do not derive benefit from His suffering. How is this ?

A. Because they neglect the conditions on which the merits of JESUS are applied to them, making the Son of God to have died in vain.

467. Q. For what sorts of sins did CHRIST die ?

A. For all sorts except man's refusing and neglecting to perform these conditions which He requires of all whom He will pardon and save. W. J. C. 1. 292.

468. Q. What remarkable event took place at our SAVIOUR's death ?

A. A great darkness overspread the whole earth, the veil of the temple was rent, and the graves were opened. S. Matt. xxvii. 51—53.

469. Q. What day does the Church observe in commemoration of the sufferings and crucifixion of our LORD ?

A. Good Friday, the most solemn fast day of

the whole year. We also observe a fast on every Friday, keeping up the memory of the Crucifixion.

470. Q. But are there not days also on which other of His sufferings are commemorated?

A. Yes, generally the Holy Week, but especially Wednesday and Thursday in Holy Week: the first the day of His betrayal, and the second the day of His apprehension.

471. Q. What striking lessons are used on Good Friday?

A. The sacrifice offered by Abraham of his son Isaac. Gen. xxii., the First Lesson, conf. with S. John xix. the Gospel.

472. Q. What then does the Church mean to teach us by this choice?

A. That God's offering of His Son for the sins of the world, and the Son's voluntary sacrifice of Himself were foreshown in type.

473. Q. Then our Church assents to the principle of typical teaching in the Bible?

A. Yes, for there are very many evidences of this teaching scattered throughout the Bible, some recognised by the interpretations of the New Testament, and some are left to the student of Holy Scripture to apply for himself.

### *Dead.*

474. Q. Why do you add to His being crucified that He died?

A. It is necessary to show that He died—

1. Because of the prophecies, which foretold

His death, and must therefore be shown to have been fulfilled. S. John xix. 33, 36.

2. Because our salvation depends upon His having died for us. Phil. ii. 7, 8; Heb. ix. 22; Heb. xiii. 11, 12; Isa. liii. 7, 8, 10.—*See Wake, 47.*

475. Q. What did our SAVIOUR Himself say before His death?

A. “It is finished,” to show that His object in dying for the sins of the world was accomplished.

476. Q. What does this further demonstrate?

A. That He died of His own free will (S. Luke xxiii. 46), commanding His Spirit and giving up the ghost, according to His own declarations that He came to give His life a ransom for many (S. Matt. xxviii.), and that “no man taketh away My life from Me. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again.” S. John x. 18.

477. Q. How do you know that He was quite dead?

A. 1. By the Scriptures; dissolution of the soul and body. S. Matt. xxvii. 50; S. Luke xxiii. 46.

2. The evidence of the soldiers who brake not His legs, seeing He was dead already. S. John xix. 33.

3. The issue of water and blood a sign. S. John xix. 34; Bloomfield’s Greek Testament; 1 Cor. v. 7.

478. Q. What use does Bishop Pearson make of the blood and water pouring out?

A. Out of His sacred but wounded side came blood and water, both as evident signs of His pre-

sent death, as certain seals of our future and eternal life. These are the two blessed sacraments of the Spouse of CHRIST, each assuring her of the death of her beloved. Rom. vi. 3; 1 Cor. xi. 26.

479. Q. As there was a separation of the Soul and Body of CHRIST, was there any disunion between them and His Deity?

A. Although He was more than man, yet He died no more than man can die; a separation was made between His soul and body, but no disunion of them and His Deity.—*Pearson*.

480. Q. What should we learn for our improvement on CHRIST's death?

A. We should learn to die to sin, and mortify the flesh with its affections and lusts.

481. Q. How was it made afterwards an article by the Apostles?

A. Acts ii. 23; v. 30; x. 39, 40.

482. Q. What took place when our SAVIOUR gave up the ghost?

A. There was a great earthquake and the veil of the temple was rent in twain.

483. Q. What did that symbolise?

A. That now the way into the holiest was made clear.

484. Q. Do we still retain in our worship any barrier between the congregation and the holy place?

A. Yes, but only for reverence, not to prevent access. The privileges of the sanctuary are now as fully open to the people as to the priest.

485. Q. What other event happened?

A. Many bodies of the saints which slept arose.

486. Q. What did this prove?

**A.** 1. That these saints of the Old Testament had been enjoying rest in their spirits in the region of departed souls.

2. That now as first fruits of the future resurrection many saints did, as it were forerunners of CHRIST, go before Him into the highest heavens and await His Ascension; or more probably, they remained ministering to Him during the great forty days, and then ascended with Him into the heavens.

*Buried.*

487. Q. Why is it necessary to believe that CHRIST was buried?

**A.** 1. As being one of the nation of the Jews He must be buried according to the custom of His country.

The patriarchs buried. Even criminals were buried with the implements of their death.

2. He was to be buried according to the prophecies. Ps. xvi. 9, 10; S. Matt. xii. 40; Isa. liii. 8, 9.

3. It shows Him to be truly man as subject to the laws to which other men find themselves subject, i.e., to descend to the grave with the body after the soul had departed from its tenement.

4. To show that He was really dead, and that no deceit had been practised by His disciples; as having been delivered up after Pilate had satisfied himself (S. Mark xv. 44, 45) that He was really dead.

488. Q. But as the Romans did not bury their dead, how came CHRIST to be buried?

**A.** So far from burying their dead they burnt them, and for their criminals they kept their dead bodies exposed with a guard over them.

489. Q. How then did our SAVIOUR escape this indignity?

**A.** In two ways.

1. The Jews did not wish (agreeably with their law) that His Body and those of the two thieves should remain upon the cross during the Sabbath. S. John xix. 31, &c.

2. By their law it was not allowed that the body of one hanging from a tree should remain suspended during the night. Deut. xxi. 22, 23.

Hence the Chief Priests and Scribes themselves were obliged to seek from Pilate in execution of their law, that the body of JESUS should be delivered to them.

490. Q. And whom does it appear that on this occasion they employed?

**A.** Joseph, a rich man of Arimathaea (S. Matt. xxvii. 57), who was also himself JESUS's disciple, but secretly for fear of the Jews (S. John xix. 38), an honourable counsellor (S. Mark xv. 43), a good man and a just, who had not consented to the counsel and deed of them (S. Luke xxiii. 50, 51), went in boldly unto Pilate and craved the body of JESUS. (S. Mark xiv. 43.)

491. Q. And what purpose did this distinction serve?

**A.** That as the two thieves were in their death like unto Him, so in their burial, a sign of honour, they were different: since Divine Providence placed

Him with the rich in His death, a counsellor and ruler of the Jews being induced to give Him honourable burial.

492. *Q.* And what Scripture was hereby confirmed?

*A.* S. Matt. xxvii. 60; S. Mark xv. 43—46; S. John xix. 38, &c.; comp. Isa. liii. 8.

493. *Q.* And had not some other distinctions of a like kind anticipated His burial?

*A.* Yes; S. Mary Magdalene had, as our SAVIOUR Himself acknowledged, in a prophetical action, anointed Him for His burial. S. Mark xiv. 3, 8.

494. *Q.* And how did Joseph of Arimathaea provide our SAVIOUR's tomb?

*A.* By giving Him his own new tomb, wherein never man had been laid.

495. *Q.* In what other way is it apparent that He made His grave with the rich?

*A.* By the costly preparations of S. Mary Magdalene and the other women for His burial.

496. *Q.* What are we taught from the manner of our LORD's burial?

*A.* To pay due reverence to the body even after the spirit has departed. 1st. As having been while in life the temple of the HOLY GHOST, and yet to be restored to its former dignity under more perfect circumstances. 2ndly. As being that framework in which the miracle of the resurrection is to be accomplished.

497. *Q.* What does the Burial of CHRIST symbolise to us as Christians?

*A.* Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12. Our burial by

baptism unto sin, and our resurrection to newness of life.

498. Q. What day is kept in the Church in commemoration of CHRIST's burial?

A. Easter Eve.

*Art. V. He descended into hell : the third day He rose again from the dead.*

499. Q. After His crucifixion and death, do we certainly know from the Scriptures that our SAVIOUR went to any particular place?

A. He promised one of the thieves who were crucified with Him that he should be with Him that very day in Paradise. S. Luke xxiii. 43. *εν τῷ παραδείσῳ.* To this place then He doubtless went.

500. Q. The thief prayed that he might be remembered when He came to His kingdom. Did he not mean in heaven?

A. Very probably ; but our LORD in His answer could not have meant heaven by Paradise.

501. Q. Why not?

A. Because it was only after His resurrection that He is expressly said to have ascended up into heaven to sit at the right hand of GOD, whereas the going to Paradise must be an entirely different action from this.

502. Q. What great change had taken place at the Resurrection and Ascension?

A. Body and soul were re-united, which could not have been the case that day in which He promised to be with the thief in Paradise.

503. *Q.* Why not?

*A.* Because His body was in the grave and His soul separated from it; for at His crucifixion He had commended His Spirit into the hands of His FATHER. S. Luke xxiii. 46.

504. *Q.* Then Paradise is a different place from heaven?

*A.* Yes; correctly speaking, it is not the heaven, to the blessings of which we are to be admitted on the re-union of our souls and bodies at the general resurrection, and where CHRIST sits at the right hand of His FATHER. See Bull, Serm. iii. 61.

505. *Q.* Then what do you understand it to be?

*A.* The resting place of the souls of those who are departed in the LORD until the great Judgement day. Rose's Parkhurst.

506. *Q.* Is it called or described by any other name?

*A.* In the narrative of the rich man and Lazarus—it is described as being "Abraham's bosom." S. Luke xvi. On this and Hades conf. Bull, 62, 3.

507. *Q.* Why was it necessary that CHRIST should go there?

*A.* 1. Doubtless to satisfy the condition of His humanity which obliged Him to pass through every stage to which our nature is subject. 2. To give assurance to the holy men from Adam downwards to His own time, who had been waiting for this day of His triumph over death and the grave. Heb. ii. 17; S. John viii. 56. Secker, 75.

508. *Q.* But the Creed says, He descended

into hell. Is there any place that says of CHRIST that He went down into hell?

*A.* He certainly must have gone into a place called hell, because, (Acts ii. 25, 27,) in the Acts of the Apostles that prophecy of David is quoted as realized, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt Thou suffer Thy Holy One to see corruption."

509. Q. It has been supposed that this was the place of torments. For what object is it concluded that He descended there?

*A.* To spoil principalities and powers—to preach to the souls in prison—to bring captives from hell and triumph over the prince of hell—to pay the full penalty of sin by going in our stead to the place of its punishment.

510. Q. How is this view disproved?

*A.* Because we hear of His bringing no captives with Him on His return to earth by His Resurrection. And our SAVIOUR had already paid the full penalty of sin on His Cross and had declared His work finished. He therefore did not suffer for us the torments of hell as it has been affirmed.

511. Q. But are there not Scriptural passages to this effect?

*A.* None but such as are all plainly capable of a different interpretation. Secker, 73.

512. Q. Then what is meant by CHRIST's descent into hell?

*A.* That He went into the place of departed souls, (in the Greek *Hades*,) who were there waiting for the day of general resurrection.

513. Q. But the place into which He went was

Paradise *παράδεισος*, and that I have always understood as meaning a place of happiness—whereas Hades was the place into which the rich man went.

*A.* Hades in fact includes two separate portions of the same region—Paradise, the place of souls awaiting in bliss the re-union of their bodies; and the place of wicked souls, such as that to which Judas went, *εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον* to the place suited to him. Acts i. 25. *Γεέννα*, Gehenna. S. Matt. v. 29, 30. See Josephus's *Ant.* xviii. 1, 3, as quoted in Rose's Parkhurst.

*Note.*—In Acts i. 25, *ἴδιος τόπος* is the proper or destined place. See Gal. vi. 9; 1 Tim. ii. 6; vi. 15, where Chrys. explains *ἴδιος* by *προσηκούσιν* fit, convenient, one's own. Acts ii. 6. Rose's Parkhurst. See also Bishop Bull's Sermon on the Middle State.

514. *Q.* Is not this division consistent with the traditions of ancient nations?

*A.* They expressed Tartarus and the Elysian fields under the name of Inferi. Pearson, notes 401.

515. *Q.* What is the literal meaning of hell?

*A.* It is a Saxon term, hellan, for the covered or unseen place, answering to Hades ('Αΐδης) Rose's P.

516. *Q.* But is not hell—Hades—often used to signify the grave?

*A.* Yes; but it could not mean the grave in Acts ii. 25, 27, for a soul does not rest in the grave. Gen. xxxvii. 35; 1 Sam. ii. 6.

517. *Q.* Does it not often denote the place of the damned, wherein they are to be tormented for ever?

*A.* The word *Gehenna* is commonly used to express the punishment of lost souls. S. Matt. v.

22, 30 ; x. 28 ; xxiii. 33 ; S. Luke xii. 5. In Ps. ix. 17, *Hades* is used. Secker, 73.

518. Q. What militates against the view of the place of material torments being intended in the Scripture accounts of the descent of CHRIST into hell?

A. That this place is described as being prepared for the devil and his angels, as if it were not as yet even occupied by them. S. Matt. xxv. 41.

*Note.*—The same notion seems to be conveyed by 2 S. Pet. ii. 4, where the Angels that sinned, notwithstanding God's having *ταρταρόν*, tarterosas, “cast them down to hell,” are yet said to be “delivered into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment.”

519. Q. What is your conclusion then on this subject?

A. That CHRIST's Body was laid in the sepulchre, and that His Spirit returned unto God Who gave it, (Eccles. xii. 7,) and to Whom He had committed it, and, together with the soul of the penitent thief, was carried by the holy angels into Paradise, where the souls of the righteous rest till the day of the Resurrection. And from thence it returned on the third day and was again re-united to its body as ours also shall be at the day of Judgment. *Wake*; Secker.

520. Q. What is the Limbus Patrum of the Church of Rome?

A. A prison in which, it is supposed, the souls of holy men who died before the time of CHRIST were shut up, and to deliver whom they say our SAVIOUR now went down thither.—*Wake*.

Certainly CHRIST did descend *virtually*, i.e., the power and virtue of His death was such that He conquered for us the powers of hell. Rev. i. 18; Acts ii. 36. *Nicholson.*

It should be noted also that Nicholson says, The ancients and many sound modern Divines judge that CHRIST did locally descend into hell, not to suffer there, but to triumph over Satan in his own territories. They urge Acts ii. 27; Eph. iv. 9; Rom. x. 7; 1 S. Pet. iii. 18, 19; Col. ii. 15.

521. Q. What day do we keep in commemoration of this event?

A. Easter Eve is both kept for commemoration of the descent into hell and for the burial of CHRIST.

*The third day He rose again from the dead.*

522. Q. What are we taught by the words, He rose again?

A. It is not said, 'was raised again,' but He rose again. I affirm therefore in the Creed that CHRIST JESUS by His own will and power raised Himself from the dead, (brought His soul and body together in vital conjunction).

523. Q. Did not the Almighty FATHER concur therein?

A. Most truly; and even the HOLY SPIRIT. Acts ii. 24; iii. 15; iv. 10; Rom. viii. 11.

524. Q. Are we concerned to affirm with the Creed that JESUS raised Himself from the dead?

A. Yes; for it is an essential point in which the Divinity of the SON is concerned no less than the verity of His own prophetic declarations. For first He Himself promised it in His words to His

Disciples. "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up again." S. John ii. 19. And "therefore doth My FATHER love Me because I lay down My life that I may take it up again. No man taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again." S. John x. 17, 18.

525. Q. Is it right then to say that He was raised by GOD?

A. Inasmuch as He Himself was GOD, and the two other Divine Persons co-operated in the work of CHRIST's Resurrection; we should also say that He was raised by GOD's power. Acts ii. 24, 32; xiii. 30; Gal. i. 1.

526. Q. What was the value of the testimony to His Resurrection?

A. Those who testify to it were eye witnesses. Acts i. 21, 22; iii. 15; v. 32; x. 39, 41.

527. Q. What is the testimony of the Apostles to His resurrection?

A. S. Matt. xxvii. 62; xxviii. 11; S. John xix. 33, 34; xx. 12, 19, 25, 27, 28; S. Luke xxiv. 37; Acts i. 3, 21, 22; ix. 4, 5; xxii. 8; ii. 4, 32; iii. 8, 15; iv. 8, 10, 33; v. 12, 15, 31, 32. The witness of His enemies and His friends. S. Mark xv. 39.

528. Q. And what seems on the part of His enemies to be a convincing proof of His Resurrection?

A. The soldiers who were placed to watch the tomb reported that His disciples came by night and stole His body from it. Now besides the unlikeness of the disciples doing this, it is quite cer-

tain that the soldiers, a guard of sixty men, if they really had allowed Him to be carried off, would have been put to death for such extreme neglect. On no other supposition, it is plain, could they have been allowed to live but that they might propagate the lie.

529. Q. What are the types of His Resurrection?

A. Jonah i. 17; ii. 10; conf. S. Matt. xii. 40; xvi. 21; S. John ii. 19; Sheaf of first-fruits, Lev. xxiii. 10; conf. Rom. xi. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 20, 23.

530. Q. On what day of the week did He rise again?

A. The first, on Sunday. S. Mark xvi. 9.

531. Q. And how is this day regarded by Christians?

A. As the LORD'S Day. Rev. i. 10.

532. Q. How is it made out that He rose on the third day?

A. Suffered on the sixth day. S. Matt. xxvii. 45; rose on the first; S. Matt. xxviii. 1; and so was dead part of Friday, all Saturday, and part of Sunday morning.

*Note.*—Not sooner nor later. 1. Sooner He would not arise, that He might take all occasion away from His adversaries of cavilling, that He was not truly dead; it was that His death should not be questioned.

2. Longer He would not defer it, for as physicians teach, after seventy-two hours the body putrifies: partly that He might bring comfort to His disciples.

3. The type in Jonah was fulfilled. S. Matt. xii. 30. *Nicholson.*

533. Q. Do we keep any special Sunday in the year in commemoration of this event?

A. Easter Sunday.

534. Q. What were the purposes of His Resurrection?

A. 1. By His Resurrection we are assured of the justification of our persons, and that the great debt of our sin is discharged. Rom. iv. 25.

By His death we know that He suffered for sin; by His resurrection we are assured that the sins for which He suffered were not His own: had no man been a sinner, He had not died; had He been a sinner He had not risen again: but dying for those sins which we committed, He rose from the dead to show that He had made a full satisfaction for them, that we believing in Him might obtain remission of our sins, and justification of our persons: GOD sending His own SON in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh (Rom. viii. 3), and raising up our surety from the prison of the grave did actually absolve, and apparently acquit Him from the whole obligation to which He had bound Himself, and in discharging Him acknowledged full satisfaction made for us. (Rom. viii. 33, 34.)

—Pearson.

2. CHRIST's Resurrection is a convincing proof to us that we also shall rise again. Begotten unto a lively hope (1 S. Pet. i. 3, 4), we become the children of the Resurrection, the members of that Body of which CHRIST is the Head; if the Head be risen, the members cannot be far behind. Col. i. 18; S. Luke xx. 36; Rom. viii. 11.

535. *Q.* Explain what you mean by Justification.

*A.* "God's justifying does import His acquitting us from guilt, condemnation, and punishment, by free pardon and remission of our sins, accounting us and dealing with us as just persons, upright and innocent in His sight and esteem," and is by S. Paul made the immediate consequence of Baptism, as Baptism is of Faith.

*Note.*—In Baptism we "die to sin," (Rom. vi. 2), by engagement to lead a new life, and so dying we are said to be justified or freed from sin (Rom. vi. 6, 7, 18, 22), which freedom from sin, obtained in Baptism, is frequently declared to be the remission of sin then conferred and solemnly confirmed by a visible seal. So again we are said to be "justified by faith," and the immediate consequent of faith by Scripture is Baptism; therefore dispensing the benefits consigned in Baptism is coincident with justification; and that dispensation is frequently signified to be the cleansing us from sin by entire remission thereof.—*Barrow's Sermon on Justification by Faith.* See Appendix II. for a fuller exposition.

536. *Q.* What were the immediate fruits of our Blessed Lord's Resurrection?

*A.* He appeared many times to His disciples to teach them the things pertaining to the kingdom of God (Acts i. 3,) and to institute several holy rites.

537. *Q.* Concerning what special institutions did He give them instructions?

*A.* He instructed them concerning Baptism, S. Mark xiv. 15; concerning the remission of sins,

S. John xxiii. 20 ; He opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures, and gave them a commission to preach repentance and remission of sins in His Name, beginning at Jerusalem. S. Luke xxiv. 47.

538. Q. Did He not at this time give some wonderful signs of the power of His glorified body?

A. Yes ; He appeared in the midst of His disciples in rooms, the doors of which had been by them carefully locked and barred.

539. Q. What may we learn from this ?

A. Generally, that we shall be like Him in the possession of our glorified bodies. Rom. vi. 5 ; Philemon iii. 21 ; 1 Cor. xv. 49.

540. Q. What practical teaching arises from this Article ?

A. 1. That we are to reckon ourselves as dead unto sin. CHRIST being raised from the dead, &c. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves, &c. Rom. vi. 9, 11.

2. That as He rose from the grave, so we are to rise from sin to a new life ; for sin is a sleep, or worse, a death, "Dead in sin." Eph. ii. 1 ; Col. ii. 13 ; Eph. v. 14.

3. To be done without delay, Rom. xiii. 11 ; 2 Cor. vi. 2 ; Heb. iv. 7, and perfectly all to be shaken off, like the linen napkin in the grave of CHRIST. 1 Thess. v. 23. See Nicholson, 47.

*Art. VI. He ascended into heaven.*

541. Q. What do you understand by this Article ?

**A.** That our Blessed LORD did locally and visibly ascend into the highest heaven. Eph. iv. 10. Oxford Cat.

542. **Q.** How many days was this after the Resurrection?

**A.** Forty days.

543. **Q.** What was the place from whence He ascended?

**A.** Bethany.

544. **Q.** What day is kept by the Church in commemoration of this event?

**A.** Holy Thursday, or Ascension Day.

545. **Q.** What was the manner of CHRIST's ascension?

**A.** S. Luke xxiv. 50, 51; S. Mark xvi. 19; Acts i. 9, 10. He was parted from them and received up into heaven.

546. **Q.** Does He not somewhere affirm that the Son of Man was in heaven before?

**A.** This is an allusion to His Divine Nature—as Man He had not been there before.

547. **Q.** What did He before He left His disciples?

**A.** He lifted up His hands and blessed them.

548. **Q.** The disciples then actually saw Him ascend. Of what importance was this?

**A.** It enabled them, as eye witnesses *αὐτόντας* (S. Luke i. 2, Nicholson,) to strengthen the faith of the Church in this important Article.

549. **Q.** What took place whilst the disciples were still looking after Him?

**A.** Two angels appeared unto them and made a promise of our SAVIOUR's re-appearance at some

future time in like manner. **Acts** i. 9—11; **S. Matt.** xxiv. 30; **1 Thess.** iv. 16. A cloud received Him out of sight, and He is to come again in a cloud. **Rev.** i. 7; **S. Luke** xxi. 27.

550. **Q.** Did **CHRIST** ascend in the same body which He had during His ministry on earth?

**A.** It was the same body that rose again, and **S. Thomas**'s want of faith gave us an additional confirmation in the fact that He showed His hands and His feet, with the marks of the nails, &c.

551. **Q.** By what power did He ascend?

**A.** His own. **Ps.** lxviii. 18; **S. John** iv. 13; xx. 17.

552. **Q.** Did He ascend in His Divine Nature only?

**A.** If it be meant, Did His Divine Nature co-operate in the Ascension—Yes; if it is meant that it was not present at the same time elsewhere—No; for **CHRIST**'s Divine Nature must be ubiquitous (ubique, everywhere) in heaven and on earth. **Jer.** xxiii. 24.

553. **Q.** Which nature was exalted, the Divine or Human?

**A.** The Human, since the Divine could not be exalted.

554. **Q.** Did our **SAVIOUR** go into the immediate presence of **GOD** the **FATHER**?

**A.** Yes. He sat down at the right hand of **GOD**.

555. **Q.** As respects His human presence where is He now?

**A.** Bodily in heaven, but by the power of His Divinity His Humanity in its effects is present

with His Church—that the **LORD GOD** might dwell among men. S. Matt. xxviii. 20; Ps. lxviii. 18.

556. **Q.** Was there any type of **CHRIST'S ASCENSION** in the Jewish Ritual?

**A.** 1. The High Priest went into the holy place before the Ark with the blood of the sin-offering. Heb. ix. 7, 11, 12, 23—25. 2. On the day of atonement (Lev. xvi. 15,) the High Priest entered into the most holy place and sprinkled blood upon the mercy seat. Till this was done the blood of the sacrifice had no efficacy. 3. In the ascent of the Ark up Mount Sion. Ps. xxiv., xlvi. 5, 8: 2 Chron. v. 2: vi. 1, 2; 2 Sam. vi. 12, 14.

557. **Q.** What distinguished persons in the Old Testament are clearly marked out as types of the Ascension?

**A.** Joseph, Ps. cv. 20—22. Elijah, Solomon, Ps. lxxii.; 1 Kings i. 35.

558. **Q.** Why was it requisite our **SAVIOUR** should ascend into heaven?

**A.** It was requisite our **SAVIOUR** should ascend into heaven, that He might appear in the presence of God for us, fill us with heavenly gifts, prepare a place in heaven for us, and receive us into it. S. John xiv. 3. Oxford Cat.

*And sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.*

559. **Q.** What do you mean by “sitteth?”

**A.** 1. To express the absolute authority—the

sovereign power of JESUS CHRIST and the ease with which He rules His subjects. Heb. i. 3, 4; S. Luke xxii. 69; S. Matt. xxvi. 64; xxviii. 18.

2. Dignity. Wake: "in the full possession and duration of His regal office and dignity till He shall have finished the work of our Redemption."

560. Q. How is it that S. Stephen in his martyrdom saw Him standing instead of sitting?

A. As representing His earnest interference in the affairs of His Church then in S. Stephen's person suffering persecution. Also the act of mediation and intercession with the FATHER. Heb. ix. 24. CHRIST is entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.

561. Q. What do you understand by God's right hand?

A. Not a bodily hand. GOD is a spirit without parts or passions, Art. 1. I mean, therefore, the highest place of heavenly power.

*Illustration.*—The right hand as being the stronger is the best fitted to represent dignity and power. Ps. xliv. 3, 4; xcvi. 2. We do not suppose that God has any material hand, or eye, or other parts like man, but that He has the power which each of these members represent in ourselves. God sees from the fountain of light and does not want any instruments. The eye is not the power of sight any more than the telescope which enables us to see objects hidden from the naked sight.

See Questions on Collects, 156. GOD can see us without an eye.

The eye or the hand is not the power of seeing or of touching, but only the instrument of the conveyance of both.

562. Q. Give Scripture passages declaring CHRIST's exaltation and glorification.

A. Phil. ii. 9 ; Eph. i. 20 ; Heb. i. 2—4, &c.

563. Q. What extent of signification are we to give to these places ?

A. He has all power in heaven and earth. Eph. i. 21. See Collects (Questions on), p. 156. Eph. i. 22, 23.

564. Q. For what purpose does our SAVIOUR sit at the right hand of GOD ?

A. 1. He there sits as our great High Priest in the Holy of Holies offering the propitiatory sacrifice of His Body and Blood, the one Mediator (Lat. *medius*) between GOD and man, our Advocate (1 S. John ii. 12) interceding (going between, *intercedo*) for His Church. Heb. vii. 25 ; viii. 1, 3 ; ix. 11, 12, 24 ; 1 Tim. ii. 5 ; Rom. viii. 34.

2. He thence superintends all the prophetical teaching and guidance necessary for His Church's welfare, enabling them to speak the word in due season.

3. He sits there as a King to rule His Church, and as the guardian of her prosperity and welfare, (Acts ii. 36) for the rule, guidance, reconciliation, and salvation of His people.

4. To send the HOLY GHOST the Comforter. S. John xvi. 7 ; Ps. lxviii. ; to lead captivity captive ; to receive gifts for men.

565. Q. For what end is CHRIST ascended into heaven?

A. 1. To prepare a place for us, that where He is there we may be also. S. John xiv. 3, 4.

2. "And hath opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers." *Te Deum.*

566. Q. Why are the words FATHER Almighty added here?

A. To show to us the truth and fulness of all that authority and dominion to which CHRIST as our Mediator is advanced. *Lewis.*

567. Q. Since we are in these relations to CHRIST our risen LORD—what are we encouraged in doing?

A. Since we have an Advocate and such a High Priest, Heb. iv. 15, 16; x. 21, we are to come boldly to the throne of grace.

568. Q. What should we learn from our SAVIOUR's having left the earth at the early age of thirty-three?

A. To despise the world when we are best able to enjoy it, and to reserve our full vigour for heaven and for His love.

569. Q. Should we learn anything from the fact of one so dear to us being in heaven?

A. We should yearn to be there where He has gone before. "Whom have I in heaven but Thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire in comparison of Thee." Ps. lxxiii. 25. To set our affections on things above, not on things on the earth. See Col. iii. 1.

*Art. VII. From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.*

570. Q. What do you think the words "from thence" imply?

A. That He shall for a time take leave of the highest heaven, the infinite glory of His FATHER's throne, in order that He may come to judge the world as that Man appointed by the FATHER; for Him must the heaven receive till the time of the restitution of all things. Acts iii. 21; xvii. 31; x. 42. He will come as the Head of the Body, His Church—as the King to His kingdom.

571. Q. Will CHRIST then come and judge us as a man?

A. The FATHER hath given Him authority and power because He is the Son of Man and touched with the feeling of our infirmities. S. John v. 27; Heb. iv. 17.

572. Q. But will He not come with glory?

A. Yes; that is an express article of the Nicene Creed. "And He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead." With power and great glory. S. Matt. xxiv. 30; S. Mark xiii. 26. The LORD JESUS shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels, 2 Thess. i. 7; shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of an archangel, and with the trump of GOD, 1 Thess. iv. 16; coming in the clouds of heaven, S. Matt. xxvi. 64; Rev. i. 7.

573. Q. What is the ancient interpretation by the Jews of the word "clouds?"

A. The glorious attendance of the angels wait-

ing upon the Son of Man. *Pearson.* S. Luke ix. 26, He shall come in His own glory and in His FATHER's, and of the holy angels.

574. Q. Was it always expected that our Blessed LORD was to have a second coming?

A. As often as we hear of His coming to suffer we learn also that the MESSIAS was to come in glory.

575. Q. What two remarkable prophecies were there to this effect?

A. S. Jude 14; Dan. vii. 13, 14: the angels testify the same; Acts i. 11, This same JESUS shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven.

576. Q. What is the great object of this display of power and of majesty?

A. That He may come with full authority and appear most fit to judge both the quick and the dead.

577. Q. What are the reasons of His coming again?

A. 1. To confound His enemies by sight of Him Whom they pierced. Zech. xii. 10; Rev. i. 7.

2. That having prepared a place for us, He should receive us unto Himself. S. John xiv. 3, 28; Heb. x. 37.

3. To vindicate God's dealings, and make His judgments, which are now sometimes dark, plain and clear;—reward the righteous sufferer and punish the evil doer.

We see the contrary now. Eccles. viii. 14; Heb. xi. 26—38. So Dives and Lazarus. S. Luke xvi. 25.

4. To make manifest every man's work. 1 Cor. iii. 13; 2 Cor. v. 10; S. Luke viii. 17; Exod. xviii. 22; xxxiii. 16.

578. Q. Will not the judgment be in effect merely that sentence which our consciences pass upon our actions?

A. 1. Our bad actions not only generate in us the disapproval of conscience, but they create in us a feeling of fear and terror. Rom. ii. 14—16.

*Pearson.*

2. There are besides the actual circumstances all the terrible effects of a pronounced denunciation.

579. Q. When is the time of CHRIST's coming to be?

A. The end of the world.

580. Q. How is it described?

A. The times of the restitution of all things, the great and terrible day of the LORD. Acts iii. 21; xvii. 31.

581. Q. Will it not be sudden?

A. 1 Thess. v. 2.

582. Q. What will be the mode in which He will conduct His judgment?

A. S. Matt. xxv. 33—46; Rev. ii. 23; vi. 16; xx. 12.

583. Q. What do you observe concerning the righteousness of it?

A. Not only is it right that men should suffer the punishment of their sins; but right it is that they should receive open and public condemnation of them. It is right also for the good man that he should be publicly acquitted; for he has been hitherto openly involved in the consequences of

Adam's sin, and a public and final acquittal is necessary.

584. Q. State further some of the particulars of the Judgment Day.

A. 1. We must stand before the Judgment seat of CHRIST. Rom. xiv. 10.

2. We shall have to give account of every idle word spoken. S. Matt. xii. 36.

3. Every evil work will be made known. Eccles. xii. 14; 1 Cor. iv. 5.

Though to the good man his sins shall not be mentioned to him. Ezek. xviii.

585. Q. How will judgment be given?

A. According to our works, whether they are good or evil. 2 Cor. v. 10; Rom. ii. 6.

586. Q. Who are the quick?

A. Those who, at the day of Judgment, are remaining alive on the earth. 1 Thess. iv. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52.

587. Q. What order is to be observed in the resurrection and judgment?

A. 1. The dead, upon whose souls a kind of judgment has been already passed, will rise first. Already, for as the tree falls, so it lies, 1 Thess. iv. 16, since they are either rewarded by being in their souls with Abraham as Lazarus was; or 2. condemned in the place of torment with the rich man, S. Luke xvi. 19, ad fin.; Rev. xiv. 13.

Of these, 1st, the just shall be raised, their bodies united to their souls, and in that state shall they be judged and acquitted. 1 Cor. xv. 20, 23; 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17.

Afterwards, 2ndly, the wicked in like manner, S. Matt. xxv. 41; xix. 28; S. Luke xxii. 30; 1 Cor. vi. 2, shall be raised, judged, and condemned.

3rdly. The quick, (upon whom no such sentence as yet has been passed in their souls, since it appears that at the day of judgment, they will have never suffered the lot of the rest of their fellow mortals to submit to the separation of soul and body,) will rise to meet the LORD in the air. 2 Cor. v. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 51; 1 Thess. iv. 17; Acts xvii. 31.

588. Q. Why is this distinction made?

A. To show that all are to be included under this general judgment, and that CHRIST, Acts xvii. 31; Rom. xiv. 9, shall be the Judge of all, Acts x. 42; 2 Cor. v. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 1; 1 S. Pet. iv. 5. *Wake.*

589. Q. What should be our prevailing feeling in the belief of CHRIST's second advent?

A. It should fill us with a supreme comfort that One Who suffered and died for us and was a man like unto ourselves in all respects, sin only except, shall come at the last day to be our Judge.

590. Q. What should be our conduct in consequence?

A. We should throw ourselves entirely on His mercy and come boldly to the throne of grace. Rom. viii. 33, 34; 1 S. John iii. 21; Heb. iv. 15, 16.

591. Q. And what is to take place after all mankind are judged and assigned their several places of happiness and misery?

A. Our SAVIOUR will return triumphantly to heaven, and there reign in glory at the head of

them for ever. *Wake.* S. Luke i. 33; Heb. i. 8; comp. Ps. xlv. 6; lxxxix. 37; Dan. vii. 14, 27; GOD then to be all in all. 1 Cor. xv.

592. *Q.* And what are we promised concerning ourselves?

*A.* Col. iii. 4. Then shall we appear with Him in glory.

593. *Q.* What effect should this article have on us?

*A.* 1. Lead us to great soberness of life. 2 S. Pet. iii. 11, 14; S. Luke xii. 43.

2. To be exact in our judgment of ourselves. 2 Thess. i. 7; Rev. ii. 33; vi. 16.

3. Phil. iii. 20. Our conversation ought to be in heaven, from whence we look for our SAVIOUR the LORD JESUS.

*Art. VIII. I believe in the Holy Ghost.*

594. *Q.* Give a reason in the words of Scripture why our belief in the HOLY GHOST is of great importance.

*A.* Because we are taught that no man can say JESUS is the LORD but by the HOLY GHOST, also that we have access by one Spirit unto the FATHER. 1 Cor. xii. 3; Eph. ii. 18. See also Gal. iv. 9. S. Paul also thought the doctrine of so much importance that he made a distinct inquiry of certain persons: Have ye received the HOLY GHOST since ye believed? Acts xix.

595. *Q.* What do you understand to be the meaning of these passages?

*A.* That a true knowledge of God and His SON

**JESUS CHRIST** can only be from the gift of the Spirit.

596. *Q.* What false doctrine arose at an early period denying the need of grace to the knowledge and practice of true religion?

*A.* Pelagianism, which denies man's need of any communication of spiritual grace. *Pearson, Notes, 439.*

597. *Q.* What is the meaning of Ghost?

*A.* It is a Saxon word, Ghast, for Spirit; a substance different from body or matter. *Secker.*

*Examples.*—In Acts we have the expression of “giving up the Ghost;” so we talk commonly of apparitions as ghosts; so in Catechism, “ghostly enemy,” “all dangers ghostly and bodily;” Communion Service, “ghostly counsel.”

598. *Q.* Ghost then is the same as Spirit: Show then now the origin of the word Spirit.

*A.* As applied to the HOLY GHOST and spiritual beings it takes its origin from spiro, Lat. whence Spiritus; so, inspire, respire, expire; hence inspiration of Prophets, &c., and *πνέω* Gk., to breathe, blow; whence *πνεῦμα*; animus, also from *ἀνέμος*, wind.

*Illustration.*—There being scarcely anything more pure and subtle—more quick and powerful than wind or spirit; hence wind or spirit expresses in most languages those things which, from their tenuity and subtilty, being indiscernible to us, are yet endued with great force and swiftness of operation. Hence naturalists are wont to name that which in any body is most abstruse, most

agile, and most operative, its Spirit. Hence it comes that this word is transferred to denote those substances which are free of matter and removed from sense, but are indued (as with understanding, so) with a very powerful activity and virtue. *Barrow on Divinity of the HOLY GHOST.*

599. Q. And thus you would say the word Spirit came to be applied to the most immaterial of all beings?

A. Yes; even Pagans attributed the name to GOD. *Æn. vi. Cœlum et terram Spiritus intus agit.* Seneca said that a Holy Spirit resideth within us, an observer and guardian of our good and bad things. *Sen. Ep. 41.* *More fully in Barrow.*

600. Q. What are the great controversies concerning the HOLY GHOST?

A. Pearson, Notes, 429. The first concerns His Personality. Sabellius, Noetus, Hermogenes, and Praxeas, asserting that He is a property, characteristic, the efficacy, energy, or power of the FATHER, a heresy which was taken up in modern days by Socinus.

The HOLY GHOST is a Being in some sense truly distinct from the FATHER and the SON; hereby rejecting the opinion of Sabellius, Noetus, Hermogenes, and Praxeas; which confounding the FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST, and destroying their substantial properties, did of them all make but one Person under several names.—*Barrow.*

601. Q. And what followed hereupon as forming the second controversy?

**A.** The natural re-action upon this error was the extreme assertion of its contrary, that the **HOLY GHOST** was a Person in such a manner as to be a created Being.

The Arians, both pure Arians (such as were Aetius, Eunomius, and Eudoxius,) and the Homoiousians or Semi-Arians, (such as Eusebius and Macedonius) alike denied the Divinity and asserted the creation of the **HOLY GHOST**. Eunomius taught that He was third in nature, and the Semi-Arians and some of those, also, who were orthodox as to the Divinity of the **SON** were of the same heresy as to the nature of the **HOLY GHOST**, and were therefore called Pneumatomachi, because they disputed about the **HOLY SPIRIT**, and afterwards Macedoniani, from Macedonius, Bishop of the Church of Constantinople. (Pearson. Note 532.) This heresy was condemned in several synods, but received its heaviest blow in the second General Council held at Constantinople. Palmer, Hist. Church, 67.

**602. Q.** Were not some additional words then added to the Nicene Creed?

**A.** Yes; the **LORD** and Giver of Life, proceeding from the **FATHER**, and worshipped and glorified together with the **FATHER** and the **SON**, "Who spake by the prophets."

**603. Q.** Do you remember anywhere in Scripture that some persons denied any knowledge of the **HOLY GHOST**?

**A.** Yes; those persons who were asked by S. Paul whether they had received the **HOLY GHOST**, replied that they had not so much as heard whether there were any **HOLY GHOST**. Acts xix. 1.

604. Q. And what do you suppose was meant by that expression?

A. All that they could mean was that they had not heard of the gift of the HOLY SPIRIT in connection with their duties as Christians, because every convert to Christianity, whether Jew or Gentile, would naturally be instructed as to the Spirit of the Old Testament Scriptures. *Barrow.*

605. Q. With what instances would they be familiar?

A. The SPIRIT brooding on the face of the waters. Gen. i.; so Isa. xi.; Joel; 1 Sam. xvi. 14.

606. Q. What was S. Paul's further inquiry on this answer being made?

A. "Unto what then were you baptized?"

607. Q. And what did this question clearly intimate?

A. That the reception of Christian Baptism must have made them in the instruction preceding and in the circumstances attending it well acquainted with the HOLY GHOST.

608. Q. What was the reply?

A. "Unto John's baptism."

609. Q. Thus showing what?

A. That as S. John Baptist did not baptize according to the subsequent institution of CHRIST in the Name of the FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST, they would not know Him as bearing that exalted part in the economy of their salvation which He occupies in the Church. Also S. John vii. 39.

610. Q. Then S. Paul thought that Christian baptism pointed out the co-operation of the HOLY GHOST to our salvation?

**A.** Yes ; and further, it cannot be doubted that in asking, Have ye received the **HOLY GHOST** since ye believed ? that he thought he was speaking of a person and not of a property.

611. **Q.** Why ?

**A.** Because in being baptized we are baptized in the Name of the **HOLY GHOST** as well as that of the **FATHER** and of the **SON** ; and the two last-mentioned cannot therefore be interpreted of persons and the first only as a property.

612. **Q.** What would otherwise be so preposterous ?

**A.** That we should be entering into covenant with a Person and a notion ; professing to render our homage and obedience to a Person (the **FATHER**) and to a notion under which that Person is to be addressed, the **HOLY SPIRIT**.

613. **Q.** Considering the tendency of the terms in which the **HOLY GHOST** is spoken of to lead us to think and speak of Him as a Person, what must be our necessary conclusion if He is not really a Person ?

**A.** That we have had placed in our way a manner of speaking which imposes on us a necessity of erring.

**Note.**—To those three, by a constant economy, a certain order is assigned, some proper offices and peculiar energies are ascribed, which it is not reasonable to think done without a real foundation : “ By **CHRIST**,” says S. Paul, “ we have an access in one Spirit to the **FATHER**;” why must we proceed by this circuit, in this certain method, if the **FATHER**, **SON**, and **HOLY GHOST** are only

distinguished in name? Wherefore also does the same Apostle bless thus: "the grace of our **LORD JESUS CHRIST**, the love of **GOD** and the fellowship of the **HOLY SPIRIT** be with you all?" To what end does he distinctively assign a peculiar dispensation of operations to the **FATHER**, of ministries to the **SON**, of gifts to the **HOLY GHOST**? Wherefore likewise does S. Peter ascribe our election to the **FATHER** predestinating, to the **SON** propitiating, to the **HOLY GHOST** sanctificating? Does it agree to the gravity, simplicity, and sincerity of the Divine oracles, so in a perpetual tenor to propound those three, as three diverse, not only in names, but in reality, in manner of operation, if there be no other under all but a nominal and notional distinction? What would this be, but not only to yield us an occasion, but to impose a necessity of erring? *Barrow.*

614. **Q.** What bearing do you think the text of the three witnesses has upon this controversy?

**A.** If the text in S. John's Epistle be not authentic, yet we have the same, though not so conjoinedly, assured us in the Gospel; for "I am **He**," says **CHRIST**, "Who bear witness of **Myself**, and the **FATHER** Which sent Me beareth witness of **Me**;" and "When the **Comforter** shall come, **He** will bear witness of **Me**:" so there are, we see, three **Witnesses** which our **LORD** appeals to; but three names (as for instance **Marcus**, **Tullius**, **Cicero**,) or the same thing having three names, will not constitute three witnesses. *Barrow.*

615. **Q.** Does not the form of baptism evince this distinction?

**A.** Yes; for at our baptism we profess to ac-

knowledge the FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST ; we perform worship, and promise obedience to them all.

Sabellius sees in our doing this nothing more than as though subjects should be required to oblige their faith to Caius, Julius, and Cæsar ; which kind of proceeding it seems absurd to suppose that GOD should solemnly institute. This may be sufficient to overthrow the Sabellian error. *Barrow.*

616. Q. We proceed then to ascertain the personality of the HOLY GHOST. What do you understand by the term "person?"

A. By a person we understand a singular, subsistent, intellectual being, or an individual substance of a rational nature. (*Rationalis naturæ individua substantia.* *Boethius.*)

*Notes.*—The Greek writers use the word *Hypostasis* (*ὑπόστασις*) (which word being of wider signification does comprehend also things void of understanding,) importing substance, concretely taken, or a thing subsistent (*τὸ ἐνυπόστατον*) which term is extant even in the Scripture, where the SON of GOD, in respect to His FATHER, is called *χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ* the character of His substance or person. *Barrow, W. C. I.* ii. 451.

In fact, the word "person" is used by S. Paul as applied both to the FATHER and the SON ; to the former, *Heb. i. 3* ; to the latter, *2 Cor. ii. 10* ; as also *iv. 6*, as it should have been rendered. *Hook's Church Dict.* 7.

The Latin Church understanding *substance* by the term *hypostasis*, as used by the Greek Church, and denying three substances, would not readily use the term, but adopted the word "person"

(persona) to characterize the three distinct subsubsistencies in the one Divine essence. *Ibid.*

The word was used and well applied against the opinion entertained by the Sabellians, that there was but one real Person in the Godhead with different manifestations; and the notion of three hypostases with an individual unity in the Divine essence, was generally received in the Church as a proper means for avoiding the opposite heresies of Sabellius and Arius. *Ibid.*

617. Q. What is the testimony of Scripture to the doctrine that the HOLY GHOST is a person contrary to the doctrine that He is an emanation, power, or property, or an attribute?

A. Actions are assigned to Him which can only properly belong to a person.

1. A lie can be told unto Him. *Acts v. 3, 4,*  
9. We cannot tell a lie to an attribute.

2. The HOLY GHOST is said to be sent (*S. John xv. 26; xvi. 7,*) which cannot be predicated of an attribute or property, as mercy, immortality.

3. He is said to send forth Apostles, *Acts xiii. 4;* also *xi. 12,* to make overseers, *xx. 28;* to forbid, *xvi. 6, 7.*

4. Guides into the truth. *S. Luke xii. 12;* *S. John xiv. 26;* *xvi. 13.*

5. He descended and rested upon our LORD in a bodily shape. *S. Matt. iii. 16;* *Acts xi. 15;* *xix. 6.*

6. He is capable of being tempted, resisted, and grieved, (*Acts v. 9;* *vii. 51;* *Eph. iv. 30*); forced expressions indeed if not used of a person.

7. He intercedes with personal affections; "groanings that cannot be uttered." *Rom. viii. 26.*

*Note.*—“We can understand,” says Pearson, “what are interceding persons, but have no apprehension of interceding or groaning qualities.”

8. Can be a witness. S. John xix. 16; Acts xx. 23; v. 32.

Here S. Peter claims the Apostles as witnesses, and in the same sentence the HOLY GHOST. How personality can be meant of the one party and not of the other it is impossible to discover.

618. Q. Are there any other passages in which personality belonging to one party mentioned is implied also in others?

A. 2 Cor. xiii. 14; 1 S. John v. 7.

619. Q. Is not the HOLY SPIRIT sometimes opposed in the same discourse with the evil spirit or spirits?

A. The HOLY GHOST or good Spirit of God is clearly and formally opposed to those evil spirits which are acknowledged persons of a spiritual and intellectual subsistence. 1 Sam. xvi. 14.

*Note.*—Barrow says: The evil spirit which is opposed to the “good Spirit of God” is not an efficacy of God, but a subsistent Being; which argues the good Spirit also to be likewise subsistent.

620. Q. What is the answer made by the opponents of the doctrine of the personality of the HOLY GHOST to this way of reasoning?

A. They say that the figure Prosopopœia accounts for this; that there are expressions in Scripture which are proper unto persons, and are given unto those things which are no persons.

621. *Q.* What example can you give?

*A.* As where S. Paul says of charity that it suffereth long and is kind, personifying charity. 1 Cor. xiii. 4, &c.

622. *Q.* And what do they make of this?

*A.* They say that it is in this manner that personal actions are attributed to the HOLY GHOST, Who is no Person, but only the virtue, power and efficacy of GOD the FATHER of our LORD JESUS CHRIST.

623. *Q.* How is this objection overthrown?

*A.* By showing that there are several personal attributes given in the sacred Scriptures expressly to the HOLY GHOST which cannot be ascribed to GOD the FATHER.

624. *Q.* Give some instances.

*A.* 1. To make intercession (see Rom. viii. 27, already quoted,) is not an act which can be attributed to GOD the FATHER, for to Whom is He to intercede?

2. So (S. John xv. 26; xvi. 7; xiv. 26,) to come unto men, as being sent, cannot be ascribed to GOD the FATHER, Who sends but is never sent.

3. To speak and hear are personal actions, and both together attributed to the Spirit in such a manner as they cannot be ascribed to GOD the FATHER. S. John xvi. 13, 14.

*Explanation.*—To speak, and not of Himself, cannot be attributed to GOD the FATHER, Who doth all things of Himself. Neither could it be meant of the FATHER that He should “speak what He heareth.” See also Barrow, W. C. I. ii. 453.

625. Q. How did Socinus attempt to refute this?

A. He said that where the Spirit could not be considered as a power in GOD, it is taken for that man in which it worketh.

626. Q. How does Pearson show that this also is a vain distinction?

A. That when the HOLY GHOST is said to come unto the Apostles as sent by the FATHER and the SON, it cannot be meant that the action of an Apostle, affected with the Spirit, was sent; except we can say that the FATHER and the SON did send S. Peter an advocate to S. Peter; and also that S. Peter, being sent by the FATHER and the SON, did come unto S. Peter.

Again; compare in same way, S. John xvi. 14. "He shall receive of Mine;" here the HOLY GHOST is not taken for the FATHER; "and show it unto you," therefore He is not taken for an Apostle. In that He receiveth, the first Socinian Prosopopœia is improper; in that he sheweth to the Apostles, the second is absurd.

627. Q. What evidence does the use of the Greek pronoun bring?

A. Not *it* but *He* is the pronoun commonly assigned to the Spirit.

*Note.*—*ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας.*  
"When He (in the masculine gender) comes, the Spirit of truth," (in the neuter,) it is said in S. John's Gospel; and *τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν*, "None (in the masculine gender again) knoweth the things of GOD but the Spirit of GOD." S. John xvi. 4; xiv. 26; xv. 2, 6; 1 Cor. ii. 11.

Why otherwise, beside analogy of grammar, should the style be so tempered or inflected, but to insinuate the HOLY SPIRIT's Personality? If He were nothing else but the virtue of GOD, there were no need, or rather, it would be inconvenient so to phrase it. *Barrow*, W.C.I. ii. 453.

628. Q. You conclude then that the HOLY GHOST is a person distinct both from FATHER and SON?

A. Yes; as Archbishop Wake (p. 59,) urges summarily, He proceedeth from the FATHER, and therefore is not the FATHER. S. John xv. 26.

He is sent by the SON and therefore is not the SON. S. John xvi. 7.

He is sent sometimes by the FATHER in the Name of the SON. S. John xiv. 26.

And sometimes by the SON from the FATHER, S. John xv. 26, and therefore is neither the FATHER nor the SON. See also *Barrow*, W.C.I. ii. 463.

629. Q. What do you conclude as to the personality from the text concerning blasphemy against the HOLY GHOST?

A. That, as it appears there is a sin or blasphemy against the HOLY GHOST distinct from all other sins and blasphemies committed against GOD the FATHER or the SON of GOD—if the HOLY SPIRIT were no person, the sin could not be distinct from all other sins.

630. Q. Having proved that the HOLY GHOST, the LORD and Giver of Life (*Nicene Creed*,) is a Person, let us endeavour to ascertain whether the HOLY GHOST is truly and strictly speaking GOD.

**A.** If He is to be allowed to be a Person and yet not GOD, it would seem as though GOD allowed His glory to be assumed by another Being in such a degree as clearly to sanction Tritheism or in principle Polytheism. Isa. xliv. 8; xlvi. 8, 10.

*Note.*—This is a strong argument against Arianism, and cannot excuse the Arians from the charge of idolatry.

**631. Q.** And is there not an argument to be derived from the Form appointed by our LORD to be used in Baptism, remembering that now we have to consider that it has been already proved that the SON and the HOLY GHOST are as truly Persons as the FATHER?

**A.** We are baptized in the Name of the HOLY GHOST as well as of the FATHER and the SON. The HOLY SPIRIT is plainly here joined on equal terms with the FATHER and the SON, because, under one Name, while the Name into which we are baptized must be GOD's, as we can only make a covenant with Him. S. Matt. xxviii. 19; 1 Cor. i. 13; 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

*Note.*—When we consider that Baptism is our solemn dedication to GOD, and admission into covenant with Him,—to be dedicated to the SON and HOLY GHOST, in the same manner, in the very same act and same form of words, whereby we are dedicated to the FATHER, were they not One Supreme and Sovereign GOD with the FATHER, would make any considering man abhor the Christian religion, as the most open and bare-faced idolatry, as joining creatures with God in the most solemn act of religion, that of dedicating

men to His worship and service. *Sherlock's Vindication*, 27.

**Note.**—Worship by GOD's appointment is yielded to Him, when being solemnly baptized in His Name we do profess to place our faith and hope upon Him, we do protest our reverence and obedience to Him. The same is then exhibited, when, according to the rule of S. Paul, (2 Cor. xiii. 13,) together with the grace of our LORD JESUS, and the love of GOD the FATHER, we implore the communion of the HOLY SPIRIT. The same is not obscurely signified whenever, in the execution of Divine offices, the HOLY GHOST is put in co-ordination with the FATHER and the SON; for that by GOD, most jealous of His honour, (Isa. xlvi. 8; xlviii. 11,) should be allowed to any creature, to march in even rank, to seem advanced to an equal pitch of dignity with Himself is nowise credible, or agreeable to reason. (Why should that which is made be numbered together with his Maker, in the performing of all things? says S. Athanasius well. Ath. Orat. in Ar.) *Barrow, Divinity of the Holy Ghost.*

632. Q. What attributes does He appear to enjoy in common with the FATHER and the SON?

*A.* The language of Scripture concerning the HOLY GHOST is such as cannot be used of any created being. *Secker.*

1. Eternity is declared of Him. Heb. ix. 14; 1 Cor. ii. 10; Job xxxiii. 4.

2. Omniscience. 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11. Τὰ βάθη the depths or deepest things of GOD, and consequently all things which GOD knows or can be known.

3. Omnipresence. 1 Cor. vi. 19.

4. Omnipotence. Ps. xxxiii. 6 ; S. John xiv. 16, 17.
5. The **LORD**. 2 Cor. iii. 18.
6. Holiness. 1 S. Pet. i. 2, 22 ; Tit. iii. 5.

*Note.*—There is none holy as the **LORD**, (1 Sam. ii. 2,) neither is there any beside Thee. There is none beside God absolutely and perfectly holy, whence  $\delta\gamma\iota\omega\sigma$  the Holy One is a distinctive title of God.

7. Immensity. Ps. cxxxix. 7.

8. Divination, the knowledge of future contingencies: knowledge peculiarly high and most proper to God, and therefore called Divination; the which peculiarly is appropriated to the **HOLY SPIRIT** as its immediate principle, whence He is called the Spirit of prophecy, the Spirit of revelation, the Spirit of wisdom, the Spirit of truth. Eph. i. 17 ; iii. 5 ; Rev. xx. 10 ; S. John xv. 26. *See others in Barrow on Divinity of the Holy Ghost.*

*Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son.—  
Nicene Creed.*

633. *Q.* Is there not also an important dispute concerning the procession of the **HOLY GHOST** from the **FATHER** and the **SON**?

*A.* So important that it ended finally in the rupture of the Eastern and Western or Greek and Latin Churches.—*Pearson, Notes*, 435.

634. *Q.* In what formularies is it mentioned?

*A.* In the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, and in the Litany.

635. *Q.* When was the Article of the Procession first added?

*A.* The procession from the FATHER was first added to the Creed against Macedonius at the second General Council held at Constantinople, in "the HOLY GHOST, the LORD and Giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the FATHER," in which words the Council spoke most warily, using the words of Scripture and the language of the Church.

636. *Q.* How then were these words increased to the present form?

*A.* The question was agitated in the West, whether the HOLY SPIRIT proceeds also from the SON, in like manner as He proceeds from the FATHER. The Western Church concluded it in the affirmative, and not only declared the doctrine to be true but added the same to the Constantinopolitan Creed, and sang it publicly in the Liturgy.

637. *Q.* But was this immediately assented to by the Western Church without demur?

*A.* The passage was first added in the Spanish and French Churches; but Leo the Third, Bishop of Rome, absolutely concluded that no such addition ought to be tolerated; and he caused the Creed publicly to be set forth in the church, graven on silver plates, one in Latin and another in Greek, in the same words in which the Council of Constantinople had first penned it. And in this symbol the FATHER alone is commemorated in the procession of the HOLY SPIRIT. *See Pearson, Notes, 2, 435—6.*

638. *Q.* What was then the reason why the Latin Church insisted on this point?

*A.* To preserve the unity and subordination of the Divine Persons to each other. The SON is united and subordinate to the FATHER, as begotten by Him ; the HOLY GHOST is united and subordinate to the FATHER and SON, as proceeding both from the FATHER and from the SON ; but if the HOLY SPIRIT proceeded only from the FATHER, not from the SON, there would be no union and subordination between the SON and the SPIRIT ; and yet the SPIRIT is the SPIRIT of the SON as well as of the FATHER, and that these persons be one GOD, it is necessary that there should be an Union of Persons as well as One Nature. *Sherlock's Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, 17.

639. *Q.* How was the Greek Church willing to confess her doctrine on this point ?

*A.* The Greek Church confesses, that the SPIRIT proceedeth from the FATHER by the SON, though not from the SON ; and by and from are such niceties, when we confess we understand not the manner of this procession of the HOLY SPIRIT, as ought to have made no dispute, much less a schism between the two Churches. *Ibid.*

The addition Filioque was first admitted in the time and by the power of Pope Nicolas the First, who, by the activity of Photius, was condemned for it. So the schism between the Latin and the Greek Church began, the one relying upon the truth of the doctrine contained in those words and the authority of the Pope to alter anything ; the other either denying or suspecting the truth of the doctrine, and being very zealous for the

authority of the ancient councils. This, therefore, is much to be lamented, that the Greeks should not acknowledge the truth which was acknowledged by their ancestors, in the substance of it; and that the Latins should force the Greeks to make an addition to the Creed, without as great authority as hath prohibited it. *Pearson.*

640. Q. What is the great distinguishing Name of the HOLY GHOST?

A. The Paraclete (*παράκλητος*). S. John xii. 7. 1, Advocate, S. Jas. v. 14; 2, Comforter, S. Luke iv. 18; 3, Exhorter, Eph. iv. 1.

When it relates to the HOLY GHOST, we translate it always Comforter; when to CHRIST we render it Advocate; of which diversity there can be no reason, because CHRIST, Who is a Paraclete, said that He would send another Paraclete, and therefore the notion must be the same in both. If therefore in the language of S. John Paracletus be a Comforter, then CHRIST is the Comforter; if it be an Advocate, the HOLY GHOST is the Advocate. The most ancient Latin translations rendered it *Advocatus* even in the Gospels, in reference to the SPIRIT. So Tertullian *Adv. Prax.* cap. 9. Notwithstanding *Consolator* is of good antiquity, and it is possible that some that used *Advocatus* might understand as much: for in the ancient Christian Latin *advocare* signifieth to comfort, and *Advocatio* consolation.

What they meant by *Advocatus* is evident, that is, one which should plead the cause of Christians against their adversaries; that as there is an accuser, which is a spirit, even Satan; so there should be an Advocate to plead against that accuser, even the HOLY SPIRIT.

Paracleti among the Greeks did not plead or maintain the cause, but did only assist with their presence, entreating and interceding by way of petition as the friends of the accused party.

I conceive the notion of *παράκλητος* common to the SON and to the HOLY GHOST, to consist especially in the office of intercession, which by S. Paul is attributed to both, and is thus expressed of the SPIRIT by Novatianus : *Qui interpellat divinas aures pro nobis gemitibus ineloquacibus, ad-vocationis implens officia et defensionis exhibens munera.* *De Trin. cap. 29. Pearson.*

641. Q. May not persons have special assurances ?

A. We experience joy in the HOLY GHOST, Rom. xiv. 17, but in different degrees and at different times, the degree varying with temperaments and circumstances ; and therefore no one should despise, because he feels but little or at times, perhaps, nothing of His presence. Ordinarily, Christians know that GOD abideth with them by the Spirit Which He hath given them. 1 S. John iii. 24 ; Eph. i. 13, 14 ; iv. 30 ; 2 Cor. i. 22 ; Rom. viii. 14, 16.

642. Q. What must be done to prevent wicked persons of enthusiastic tempers from mistaking their own groundless confidences for the testimony of the SPIRIT ?

A. They must be taught that (1 S. John ii. 3,) to know GOD is to keep His commandments. S. Matt. vi. 16 ; Acts xi. 24 ; Eph. v. 9 ; Wisd. i. 4, 5.

643. Q. What is the great work of the HOLY GHOST in the Christian economy ?

**A.** Not a ministerial office or work, such as that of the created angels is, who are all ministering spirits, but whatsoever is attributed unto Him, as the work wrought by Him in the salvation of man, as sent by the FATHER and the SON. As the distinguishing work of the FATHER is creation, and that of the SON redemption, so that of the HOLY GHOST is sanctification.

*Note.*—So in Catechism—Who sanctifieth me and all the elect people of God.

**644. Q.** Why is He specially called the HOLY SPIRIT?

**A.** Rather because of His office to make holy than on account of His own personal holiness, the two other persons of the Holy Trinity being likewise as holy as Himself.

**645. Q.** In what manner does He sanctify us?

**A.** By bestowing upon the Church Apostolic gifts (Acts ii. 3, 4,) comprising diversity of gifts, (1 Cor. xii. 4 to 14,) *μερισμοῖς* distributions, (Heb. ii. 4; Rom. xi. 6, &c.; 1 Cor. xii. 28).

i. Prophetic Inspiration :

(1) Revelations. 2 S. Peter i. 21; Acts xxi. 11; xix. 6.

(2) Knowledge and power to preach the word. 1 Cor. ii. 4, 10, 13; 1 Thess i. 5.

(3) Restraining and directing the word. Acts xvi. 6; vii. 10; xxi. 4.

(4) Boldness of utterance. S. Matt. x. 19, 20; S. Luke xii. 11, 12.

ii. Illumination of the soul. 1 Cor. ii. 12, compared with Phil. i. 29; Acts xvi. 14; Heb. iv. 2;

Eph. ii. 8 ; Ps. cxix. 8. It was the known opinion of the Pelagians that it is in the power of man to believe the Gospel without any internal operation of the grace of God ; and S. Austin was once of that opinion. This, as the rest of Pelagianism, is renewed by the Socinians. *Pearson.*

iii. Miraculous gifts. 1 Cor. xiii. 9, 10 ; Acts xix. 6.

iv. Regeneration and renovation of man in all the faculties of his soul. Tit. iii. 5 ; S. John iii. 5 ; 1 Cor. vi. 11 ; S. Mark i. 8, 10 ; S. Matt. xxviii. 19 ; 1 Cor. xii. 13.

v. Direction and government of our actions and conversations (Gal. v. 25, 16 ; Rom. viii. 14,) specially in prayer. Zech. xii. 10 ; 1 S. John ii. 1 ; v. 14 ; Rom. viii. 26, 27, 34 ; S. John xiv. 16. See concerning the Paraclete Q. preceding.

vi. Ordinations. S. John xx. 21 ; S. Matt. xxviii. 20 ; Acts xiii. 6, 7 ; xx. 28.

vii. Councils. Acts xv. 28.

viii. Confirmations. Heb. vi. 2, compared with ver. 4 ; Acts xix. 2, &c.

ix. Power of the keys. S. John xx. 22, 23.

646. Q. What great blessing arises to individual members from these gifts to the Church ?

A. The indwelling of the HOLY GHOST, whereby we are made members of this one body, of which our SAVIOUR is the Head. 1 Cor. xiii. 12, 13 ; vi. 19, 20 ; iii. 16, 17.

1. Dwells in His Disciples and abides with them for ever. S. John xiv. 16.

2. They are united by Him into one body. Eph. iv. 4.

3. And made to love one another. Rom. v. 5 ; viii. 15, 16 ; Gal. iv. 6.

647. Q. What further office does the HOLY GHOST perform towards us ?

A. He assures us of the adoption of sons. Gal. iv. 5—7 ; Rom. v. 5 ; viii. 14—16 ; 2 Cor. i. 22. Gives joy. Rom. xiv. 17 ; 1 Thess. i. 6. Writes on our hearts, i.e., impresses them. 2 Cor. iii. 3.

648. Q. How long will the HOLY GHOST continue His offices to the Church ?

A. As long as any faithful shall remain to need them, according to CHRIST's promise. S. John xiv. 16 ; S. Matt. xxviii. 20.

649. Q. Why is belief in the HOLY GHOST necessary ?

A. 1. Because it is an essential part of the Creed.

2. Rom. viii. 9. If he have not that which maketh the union he is none of His. 1 Cor. xii. 3 ; S. John iii. 6. Nothing more necessary than the supply of the Spirit of JESUS CHRIST. Phil. i. 19.

3. That the will of GOD may be effectual in us to our sanctification. 1 Thess. iv. 3 ; 2 Thess. ii. 13 ; Heb. xii. 14.

4. That in our weakness we may be strengthened. Rom. xiv. 17 ; Acts xiii. 52 ; 1 S. John ii. 20, 27.

5. Necessary for the continuation of a successive ministry. S. Luke iv. 18 ; S. John xx. 21, 22 ; 1 Tim. v. 22 ; Tit. i. 5.

650. Q. Will the HOLY GHOST work all this in us without our own efforts ?

**A.** No. (Phil. ii. 12, 13 ; 2 Cor. iii. 5.) It is by the grace of the HOLY SPIRIT alone, that we are either disposed to will, or enabled to do those things which GOD and our duty require of us. But the grace is not to exclude but to assist and perfect our own endeavours, and to enable us to do that, which, without it, we should never have been able to have done. Phil. ii. 12, 13.

**651. Q.** How do we obtain grace of the HOLY SPIRIT?

**A.** See end of Pt. I. S. Matt. xiii. 12 ; xxv. 29. Greater degrees will be added. 2 S. Pet. iii. 18.

**652. Q.** What are the duties arising out of this Article?

**A.** *Nicholson*, 57.

1. That we acknowledge Him by faith to be the third Person in the Trinity, proceeding from the FATHER and the SON.

2. That we look to derive all life, light, grace, and holiness from Him. S. Jas. i. 17, 18.

3. By repentance and contrition, to have a heart prepared to receive the HOLY GHOST. Acts ii. 38.

4. To pray to GOD to bestow upon us His gifts and graces ; to prevent, excite, and assist us in our Christian profession. Ps. li. 10, 11.

5. That we submit to GOD's ordinances (S. Luke xi. 13,) and expect grace in that way in which He is pleased to bestow it, which is then done,

(1) When we are diligent in His Word. Acts x. 44 ; xvi. 14.

(2) When we receive the Sacraments, being

the ordinary conduits to convey grace unto us. 1 Cor. ii. 28; Acts ii. 38.

(3) When we are obedient to the pastors set over us by the HOLY GHOST. Heb. xiii. 17. In voce hominis, tuba Dei. The Gospel is God's trumpet in man's mouth. Acts xx. 28.

(4) When we submit to the censures or discipline of the Church. 1 Cor. v. 1—5.

6. That we call upon God that His special power and assistance may go along with His own ordinances. Eph. vi. 18, 19; 2 Thess. iii. 1.

7. That we attend and wait for the approaches of the SPIRIT, whether the access be made by any outward or inward means. S. Luke xi. 13; Acts i. 4.

(1) If it be outward in the word or Sacrament, that we lay up the seed in our heart, and bring forth fruit with patience. Col. iii. 16; S. Luke viii. 15.

(2) If the motion be more inward, and secret, that then we resist it not, nor grieve the HOLY GHOST, whereby we are sealed to the day of redemption. Acts vii. 51; 1 Thess. v. 19; Eph. iv. 30.

8. That ministers be careful to feed the flock over which the HOLY GHOST hath made them overseers. Acts xx. 28; Heb. v. 4; Eph. iv. 11.

9. That no man intrude upon any administration of the SPIRIT, without a lawful vocation, abilities, and gifts.

653. Q. Are there not also sins against the HOLY GHOST as well as duties towards Him?

**A.** Yes. One is called the blasphemy against the **HOLY GHOST**. S. Matt. xii. 31 ; S. Mark iii. 28, 29 ; S. Luke xii. 10.

654. **Q.** What is this sin understood to be ?

**A.** The speaking reproachful words deliberately and maliciously against the miracles done by the power of the **HOLY GHOST** or the supernatural gifts proceeding from Him.

655. **Q.** Who were the persons to whom **CHRIST** declared that this should not be forgiven ?

**A.** Those who had the testimony of their own senses for the reality of those miracles and gifts, and notwithstanding the fullest evidence of their coming from the **Spirit of GOD** persisted in reviling them, and even ascribed them to the devil.

656. **Q.** Is this a plain reason why this sin, under these circumstances, must be unpardonable ?

**A.** The persons guilty of it have stood out against all the means which heaven had provided for the conviction and conversion of mankind ; none more powerful remained to bring them to repentance, and, as they could not be forgiven without repenting, there was plainly no way left for their recovery.

657. **Q.** Then are timorous souls right in alarming themselves lest they should have been guilty of the blasphemy against the **HOLY GHOST** ?

**A.** It is plain that no persons can sin against the **HOLY GHOST** in this same degree, as they have not the same degree of evidence to resist.

So also as regards Heb. x. 26—29. So also  
“lying to the **HOLY GHOST**.”

658. Q. What are the offences then that we are in danger of committing against Him?

- A. 1. Grieving. Eph. iv. 29, 30.
- 2. Resisting. Acts vii. 51.
- 3. Quenching. 1 Thessa. v. 10.

*Art. IX. The Holy Catholic Church; the Communion of Saints.*

659. Q. What is the next Article of the Creed?

- A. The Holy Catholic Church.

660. Q. Does this mean that you give your trust and allegiance to her as well as believe in her existence?

A. First. I believe her existence—that there is a Church which is holy and Catholic.

2ndly. That Church alone which is holy and Catholic. *Pearson.*

3rdly. I trust to her guidance as a holy Mother, believing the words of S. Jerome: “He cannot have God for his FATHER, who has not the Church for his Mother.”

4thly. Not merely her existence, but her continuity. Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. S. Matt. xxviii. 20. *See Pearson on Perpetuity of the Church.* 573.

661. Q. How is the Holy Catholic Church otherwise expressed in the Nicene Creed?

- A. One, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

662. Q. Thus making in full—?

- A. One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

663. Q. Before considering these marks of the Church, let us define What is the Church?

**A.** The Church is that one Body (1 Cor. xii. 2—27,) or society of Christian believers, (Acts xi. 26,) which our Blessed **LORD** its one Divine Head (Eph. i. 22; v. 23) founded.

664. Q. What do we learn in Scripture concerning the foundation of this Body or society of believers?

**A.** Its foundation was promised by **CHRIST** before His death and ascension, S. Matt. xvi. 18; and we find it actually in existence after His ascension. Acts ii. *Pearson.*

665. Q. When, and in what manner was the Church founded?

**A.** Upon the Apostles. He breathed upon them, and gave them the **HOLY SPIRIT** (S. John xx. 22, and Acts ii.) to guide and to inspire it, and to be to it a bond of union. 1 Cor. xii. 13.

*Note.*—Upon S. Peter first and afterwards upon all the Apostles. S. John xx. 23; Eph. ii. 20; Rev. xxi. 14. Our **LORD** in promising the future Church said, Thou art Peter (rock), and upon this ~~terpor~~ rock I will build My Church. S. Matt. xvi. 18. When the first 3000 souls were converted to **CHRIST**, and the building thus erected of which **CHRIST** was the chief corner stone, S. Peter, with the Apostles, stood forth and said, Men and brethren, &c. Acts ii. 14, &c. Because the Apostles could not all at once declare the will of **GOD** to the assembled hearers, S. Peter was their spokesman, and thus made good the words of our **LORD**, “Upon this rock I will build My Church.” He also, besides being the Apostle of the circumcision, was selected by **GOD** to be the first to declare His will to the uncircumcision or

**Gentiles.** Thus far he was a rock. Whereas on the other hand, his infallibility was not implied. In his dispute with S. Paul he was no rock—but a stone of stumbling. This sufficiently accounts for his prominence in Scripture, and gives no colour for raising the alleged claims of the Bishops of Rome to be, as his successors, lords over the faith of their brethren.

**666. Q.** Did the **HOLY GHOST** contribute to the work of founding the Church?

**A.** By His descent, before promised by our **LORD**, as the Comforter, upon the Apostles. *Acts ii. ; S. John xvi. 13.*

**667. Q.** What does the word Church come from?

**A.** It is so translated from two different words.

1. In ecclesiastical writers it means 'the house of the **LORD**,' from the Greek *κυριακή* (*kuriake*), from *Κύριος*, and *οἰκία*, whence *kirk* in Scotland. church in England.

2. In Scripture, from the Greek word *ἐκκλησία* (*ecclesia* Lat. *église* Fr.) from *ἐκκαλεῖν* to call out, *S. Matt. xvi. 18 ; Acts viii. 1 ; Eph. i. 22* ; it means the assembly of those called out of the power of Satan into the kingdom of **GOD** by **JESUS CHRIST**. *Acts xxvi. 18 ; 1 Cor. i. 13.*

**Field, i. 22.** *ἐκκλησία*, *ecclesia*, *convocatio, cœtus evocatus*, a multitude called out, or called together.

Bp. Pearson says, 'a calling forth,' if we consider the origination; a congregation of men, or a company assembled if we consider the use of it. *ἐκκλησία* not the evocation, but the *κλῆτος* the

company called or gathered together. Hence S. Cyril: It is pre-eminently called the Church because it calls forth all, and at the same time assembles them together. Catech. xviii. 24.

668. Q. Show that the Church when considered as the house of the LORD is Scripturally viewed.

A. The Church is that spiritual house of CHRIST JESUS, its "chief corner stone," which composed "of lively stones," (1 S. Pet. ii. 5, 6; 1 Cor. iii. 9, 10,) is "builded together" by its "wise master-builders," "for an habitation of GOD through the SPIRIT," upon "the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets," (Eph. ii. 20, 22,) an immoveable rock, (S. Matt. vii. 24,) being "the Church of the living GOD, the pillar and ground of the truth," (1 Tim. iii. 15,) "a temple not made with hands, whose builder and maker is GOD."

669. Q. And now express scripturally the notion of the Church, as an assembly, ecclesia, or as the French call it, église.

A. The Church is (Eph. ii. 19,) "the household of GOD" (Gal. vi. 10,) and of faith, that (Eph. iii. 15,) sacred family of which (S. Matt. x. 25,) CHRIST Himself is the Householder, and in which (Acts xi. 26; *Bloomfield's Greek Test.*) the brethren gather together as the general assembly and Church of the First-born (Heb. xii. 22,) for instruction and deliberation and for purposes of worship. (Heb. ii. 12; 1 Cor. v. 4.)

670. Q. By what other expressions does S. Paul also describe the Church?

A. 1. As His Body. The Church, which is

the Body of the **LORD JESUS**, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. Eph. i. 23. So we being many, are one body in **CHRIST**. Rom. xii. 5. One body and one bread, (1 Cor. x. 16, 17,) Baptized into one body. 1 Cor. xii. 13.

2. Connected with which is the relation borne to Him by the Church as His Spouse. 1 Cor. vi. 15, &c.; 1 Cor. x. 16, 17; Rev. xix. 7; Eph. v. 32; Rev. xxi. 2.

**CHRIST** descended from His **FATHER**'s bosom and contracted His Divinity with flesh and blood, and married our nature, and we became a Church, the spouse of the Bridegroom, which He cleansed with His blood, and gave her His Holy Spirit for a dowry, and heaven for a jointure; begetting children unto **GOD** by the **Gospel**. By an excellent charity He feeds her at His own table, relieves her sorrows, determines her doubts, guides her wanderings; He is become her Head, and she as a signet upon His right hand. *Taylor's Marriage Ring.*

3. The City of **GOD**. Ezek. xlvi. 35. The **Holy City**. Rev. xxi. 2; Isa. lii. 1.

4. **Jerusalem**, the mother of us all. Gal. iv. 26.

The Church being the spouse of **CHRIST** is our Mother. Parentes qui nos genuerunt ad mortem, Adam et Eva; parentes qui nos genuerunt ad vitam, Christus et Ecclesia.—Augustine, Th. An. 31. The Church is in **CHRIST** as Eve was in Adam. *Hooker*, v. lvi. 7.

671. Q. Mention Scripture passages illustrative of, or exalting the glory of the Church.

*A.* Isa. xlix. 23; lx. 12.

672. *Q.* What gives being to the Church?

*A.* (Field, 1, 25.) It is the work of grace and the heavenly call that gives being to the Church, and makes it a different society from all other companies of men in the world that have no other light of knowledge, nor motion of desire but that which is natural.

Field (1, 25) defines the Church as the multitude and number of those whom Almighty GOD severeth from the rest of the world by the work of His grace, and calleth to the participation of eternal happiness, by the knowledge of such supernatural virtues as concerning their everlasting good He hath revealed in CHRIST His SON, and such other precious and happy means as He hath appointed to further and set forward the work of their salvation.

673. *Q.* Distinguish several other uses of the word Church in the New Testament as applicable to parts or the whole of the body of the faithful.

*A.* Sometimes it is used as of a material building, for a Christian place of worship. 1 Cor. xi. 18, 22; xiv. 28, 34. Sometimes for the congregation of any particular place of worship. Rom. xvi. 5; Col. iv. 15. Also for the society of the faithful under their spiritual rulers in any country or city. 1 Cor. i. 2; xvi. 19; Rev. ii. 1, 8, &c.; 1 Thess. iv. 14. Also these several bodies considered as one Church of which CHRIST is the Head. 1 Cor. xii. 28; xiv. 33; 1 Tim. iii. 15.

674. *Q.* What do we mean then when we speak of *the* Church?

**A.** The whole company of Christian believers or Catholic Church, of which JESUS CHRIST is the Head ; not the worshippers of any particular place, city, or country. (*See this subject treated, infra, under the word Catholic.*)

675. **Q.** When we say that we believe in the Church, do we mean that we believe all that the majority of Christians "at any one time" hold ?

**A.** No ; we ought to be regulated in our belief by what the Church has witnessed to as the truth from the beginning.

676. **Q.** Why is the Church called *One* ?

**A.** The Church is called **ONE** because, though divided into many members or parts, it is yet one body, (Rom. xii. 5 ; Eph. iv. 4—6 ; 1 Cor. xii. 12,) into which we are baptized by one Spirit, (1 Cor. xii. 13,) which is reigned over by one **LORD**, (S. John x. 16,) as one fold under one Shepherd.

*Note.—CHRIST is the Head of every man, says S. Paul. As one Head He has but one Spiritual Body ; and this Body as the Apostle tells us is the Church ; and no one can "hold the Head" who is not in this Body. 1 Cor. xi. 3 ; Col. i. 18, 24 ; ii. 19. Again, the Church is the Spouse of CHRIST, Who loved and gave Himself for her, and Who has no other or second Spouse. Whatsoever Church pretendeth to a new beginning, pretendeth at the same time to a new Churchdom : and whatsoever is so new is none. Pearson.*

677. **Q.** Must there be one common bond of union between all true Churches ?

**A.** As our Blessed **LORD** promised that there should be one fold and one Shepherd, so to make

good those words there must be some common bond of unity to distinguish all true Christian Churches.

678. Q. Show from the known historical condition of the Church in present and past ages how, although divided into many members or portions, it is so bonded together as you have said.

A. 1. Any number of persons baptized into CHRIST assembled under one minister for public worship, and the exercise of Christian privileges, have always and do still form a congregation or Church. 2. Further; a number of these Churches constitute the Church of one diocese under its Bishop, as the Bishoprics of London, Rochester, &c. 3. Many dioceses united under an Archbishop constitute a Province, as the Province of York, and several of these united would form such large divisions as the National Church of England, under the Archbishop of Canterbury, who is also Metropolitan. 4. A National Church thus formed and united with other Churches, all having the same form of Ecclesiastical polity, but different temporal rulers, becomes a communion, as the Episcopal Churches of Ireland, Scotland, America, and those in the British Colonies and Dependencies, constitute the Anglican Church. 5. Thus the Churches of Italy, France, and Spain, with other nations, form the Latin Church, or Church of Rome, of which the Bishop of Rome is the Ecclesiastical Head. 6. Then the Church of Rome and the Anglican Church agreeing in the essentials of the faith (but differing as to some corrupt additions of the former) form the Church

of Western Christendom. 7. And this Western Christendom considered, as in conjunction with the Eastern Church, consisting of the Churches in communion with the Greek Church, form the entire Catholic Church as united (with whatever diversity of practice and with occasional divergence of doctrine) under one Head, JESUS CHRIST.

*Illustration.*—Fountains, streams, rivers, seas, oceans, forming one connecting chain of waters, and by clouds carried back again to fountains. See Palmer's Ecclesiastical History for Irenæus. So S. Cyprian, Unit. Eccl. p. 108, Fell. Theoph. Angl. 4. See Hooker, Eccl. Pol. iii. 1. As the main body of the sea being one, yet within divers precincts hath divers names; so the Catholic Church is in like sort divided into a number of distinct societies, every one of which is termed a Church within itself.

679. Q. Why do you say these Churches are one body when they differ much in customs, rites, and even in some doctrines?

A. Because they all hold fundamental truths, —one faith, the Catholic faith, (See Athanasian Creed; Eph. iv. 5,) and keep to the covenant rites; that is to say, notwithstanding many differences, their several members are yet baptized by one Spirit, even the HOLY GHOST into one Body (1 Cor. xii. 13;) and all communicate in the one bread (1 Cor. x. 17,) of the LORD's Supper; and as one body are reigned over by one only Head, even CHRIST JESUS, having received from Him one form of government, i.e., episcopal—and one succession of rulers from the Apostles.

*Note.*—There is no obligation to hold in National Churches the same rites and ceremonies.

Art. xxxiv.

680. Q. Can we be said in any manner to hold the same faith as the Church of Rome?

*A.* We hold in common with the Church of Rome three Creeds, the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian;—an Episcopacy descended from the Apostles;—baptism, communion, confirmation; and appeal to the same body of ecclesiastical customs and law, the decrees of councils, and writings of the fathers. And thus while we abhor the unscriptural additions by which the Church of Rome has corrupted the Gospel, yet as she has never rejected the great essential truths of the Catholic Faith, but only overlaid them, we cannot, with truth and justice, deny her a part in the “one faith.”

681. Q. What duties arise out of these truths which we have been explaining?

*A.* The great duty of Unity. S. John x. 16; xvii. 11, 20, 21. Since the Church is set before us as so intimately united with JESUS CHRIST as to be His Body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all, (Eph. i. 23,) we should (Eph. iv. 3,) strive to keep the unity of the SPIRIT, (Phil. i. 27,) striving together for the faith of the Gospel.

2. Look for salvation only in communion with the Church. *See Wordsworth, Theop. Ang.* 29, 30; *Acts* ii. 47; literally “the being saved;” i.e., “those in course of being saved.” *Bloomfield's Gk. Test.*

3. Speak the same thing. 1 Cor. i. 10; ii.

18 ; Eph. iv. 3 ; Heb. xiii. 17 ; Acts iv. 32 ; being of one heart and one soul, and all of one mind. Rom. v. 6 ; Gal. iii. 8 ; 1 S. Pet. iii. 8.

4. Mark those who cause divisions and avoid them. 2 Thess. iii. 6, 14 ; Rom. xvi. 17.

682. Q. What sense has the Anglican Church shown of the evils of violating unity ?

A. In the Litany she prays : " From all heresy and schism, Good LORD, deliver us." *See also Collects for Good Friday. Prayer for Unity in Accession Service.*

683. Q. Then heresy and schism are two sins which injure the Church. What is heresy ?

A. The word is derived from *aipέw*, to choose, and means the taking up of doctrines in a wilful and personal manner against the rule, " that Scripture is not of private interpretation."

*Note.—Wordsworth, Theop. Angl.* Heresy (*αἵρεσις*) means an arbitrary adoption, in matters of faith, of opinions at variance with the doctrines received from CHRIST and His Apostles by the Catholic Church. 2 Thess. iii. 6—14 ; 2 S. John 10. Tertullian says, " We have the Apostles of the LORD for our guides, who have neither themselves *chosen* anything of their own will, which they should bring in, but faithfully sealed to the nations the discipline received from CHRIST."

684. Q. How does the Scripture speak of heresies ?

A. S. Peter speaks of damnable heresies. 2 S. Pet. ii. 1 ; Rom. xvi. 17 ; 2 S. John 10 ; Titus iii. 10. " A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject, knowing that he that is

such is subverted and sinneth, being condemned of himself," i.e., by his own choice. *Words. Th. A. 93.*

685. *Q.* If a person is in error concerning the interpretation of some part of Scripture does that make him a heretic?

*A.* A heretic is one who persists in holding and teaching for truth what he has been made well aware is contrary to the teaching of the Church Universal.

*Note.*—One who would give up his error on the truth being explained duly to him is not in heresy. A heretic declares terms of salvation for himself; whereas, see Gal. i. 8.

*Example.*—Hooker, v. lxii. 6. S. Cyprian, in the matter of heretical baptism, was "in error, but not in heresy."

686. *Q.* What is the duty of members of the Church towards heretics or schismatics?

*A. Theoph. Angl. Wordsworth, 48.* To act towards them in a spirit of charity, but not to communicate with them in their heresy or schism, or to encourage them in it, or treat it lightly, but to speak the truth in love concerning its sin and danger.

687. *Q.* What is schism?

*A.* It is derived from Gk.  $\sigma\chi\zeta\omega$  to divide, and expresses the sin of making a division in the Church or of wilfully living in separation from it.

Schism is a carnal work, and as such excludes from heaven; it is a rending of CHRIST's blessed body; and violation of the marriage compact between Him and the Church (spiritual fornication).

tion.) *Wordsworth, Th. Angl.* 45. Although the state may remove all the civil penalties of schism, it cannot diminish its religious guilt. *Norris, in W. C. J.* iii. 302, *quoted in Th. Ang.*

688. Q. What instances in the ancient Church are examples of schism?

A. The separation of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram from Moses, and of Jeroboam from the temple service of Jerusalem.

689. Q. What is the difference between heresy and schism?

A. The heretic sins against the true faith; the schismatic against the rulers of the Church. The schismatic proceeds from entertaining error to vent it in acts of rebellion.

690. Q. How far are heretics and schismatics in the Church?

A. Heretics are in some degree in the Church even after they have gone out of it, on account of the administration of the Sacraments. *S. August. and Hooker* iii. 1, 11. We must acknowledge even heretics themselves to be, though a maimed part, yet a part of the visible Church.

691. Q. And what is the danger of schism in the sinner committing it?

A. He incurs, by schism, the danger of losing the benefits of the channels or means of grace for our salvation.

*Illustration.*—Just as a limb severed from the body loses the life and sustenance of the body.—*Jones of Nayland on Ch.* 102.

692. Q. Why so?

**A.** If the schismatic cuts himself off from the true Church, he deprives himself of her Sacraments, to which the promises of life are annexed. (S. John vi. 53; S. Matt. xxvi. 26, 28.)

693. **Q.** And in what evil way is the schismatic further affected?

**A.** Schismatics incur the danger of falling into habits of censoriousness and uncharitableness, because to justify themselves they must make the worst of the communion which they abandon. *Jones of Nayland*, 102.

694. **Q.** And is salvation only offered in the Church?

**A.** The Scripture teaches us (S. John xv. 4—7; 1 Cor. xii. 21,) that as there is one body and one faith agreeing in all essential points and forming a perfect unity, we are not to expect or hope for salvation any more through opposite bodies of Christians or several differing faiths or Gospels than through several Lords. As, in fact, there is but one LORD, so one Gospel kingdom; as there is but one Head (Col. ii. 19,) of the Church, so but one Body, with which if we are not in communion, we have no life in us.

*Wordsworth, Th. Angl. 26. S. Cyprian. Ep. iv. Domus Dei una est: et nemini Salus nisi in Ecclesia esse potest. See Wordsworth, 31, 32; also 676 Q.*

695. **Q.** Are there any remarkable types which declare the same truth?

**A.** That salvation is only to be looked for in the Church, is plainly taught by the typical circum-

stances of the ark and the deluge. *Office of Baptism, first prayer.* Gen. vii. 23; 1 S. Peter iii. 21.

2. The salvation of Lot's household in the destruction of Sodom, (Gen. xix. 14,) and the appointment of a city of refuge, Zoar. Gen. xix. 19—21.

3. Door posts sprinkled with blood. Exod. xii. 23.

4. The passage of the Red Sea. *Office of Baptism.* Exod. xiv. 21.

5. The brazen serpent in the wilderness. Numb. xxi. 7.

6. Rahab's house (Josh. ii. 18, 19) secure for all who were found within it.

7. And S. Paul mystically intimates the same truth when he says, “ Except ye remain in the ship ye cannot be saved.” Acts xxvii. 31.

*Notes.—Lactantius, iv. 30, Div. Inst.* It is only the Catholic Church that hath the true worship and service of God; this is the well-spring of truth, the dwelling-place of faith, the temple of God, into which whosoever entereth not, and from which whosoever departeth, is without all hope of life and eternal salvation. *Pearson on Creed*, 1, 585. As none were saved from the deluge, &c.

696. Q. How did the Early Church and the fathers speak on this point?

A. With a most decided and uniform testimony.

*Note.—From Th. Angl. 33.* S. Cyp. says: Do you believe the remission of sins and everlasting life

through the Holy Church ? S. Aug. : Out of the Church sins are not remitted. Ignat. : If any one be not within the altar, he faileth of the bread of GOD. Iræn. : They are not sharers in the SPIRIT who do not run to the Church. And the same : It does not behove to seek the truth from others, which is easy to take from the Church. S. Prosper : Out of Jerusalem is no blessing ; since he only is sanctified who is united to the Church which is the body of CHRIST.

697. *Q.* Will none be saved, then, but those who are in the Church ?

*A.* While we assuredly believe that none who wilfully reject the only way of salvation, made known by GOD in the Church, will be saved,—we may yet humbly hope that GOD will find some way of escape for those who have never heard the glad tidings of the ark of salvation. *See last Section but one of Stretton's First Truths.*

*Note.*—Bp. Butler. Anal. Pt. ii. ch. vi. Every man will be dealt equitably with. Barrow on Universal Redemption, iii. 464, quoted in Th. Ang.

698. *Q.* Does this leave it to be believed that there can be more than one Church ?

*A.* No. CHRIST never appointed two ways to heaven ; nor did He build a Church to save some and make another institution for other men's salvation. *Bp. Pearson*, 1, 584. See Q. 693.

699. *Q.* Does not the Church of Rome profess to be this ark of salvation and the one only Church of CHRIST ?

*A.* The Church of Rome does indeed arrogate

to herself the title of the one only Church, and uncharitably and presumptuously pretends to deny salvation, not only to the members of the English Church but to all the ancient Churches of the East, that is to say, to Apostolic and Catholic Churches consisting of many millions of believers. See Q. 717.

*The Church Holy.*

700. Q. What is the meaning of holy when applied to the Church ?

A. It means, 1st, sanctification through the HOLY SPIRIT, an inward holiness.

2ndly. Separation and dedication to God's service, an outward holiness.

701. Q. What is the inward sanctification ?

A. The Church has an inward sanctification ; in that it is a body of which the HOLY SPIRIT is the life-giving principle, (2 S. Pet. i. 4,) and has been sanctified and cleansed with the washing of water by the Word, even JESUS CHRIST, (2 Cor. v. 17 ; 1 Cor. vi. 11 ; Eph. v. 26,) and has for its Head the Holy JESUS, from Whom the whole body, by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, (Col. ii. 19,) thus groweth into a holy temple unto the LORD. Eph. ii. 21.

702. Q. Does this then mean that we are sinless ?

A. It does not mean that we are sinless, but holy by our regeneration and justification. 1 S. John i. 8 ; Heb. xii. 1.

703. Q. What is its outward sanctification ?

**A.** The outward sanctification is derived from all its members being by a holy calling separated unto GOD, a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation. (2 Tim. i. 9; 1 S. Pet. ii. 9; Eph. ii. 6, 19.) Also because of its object to make holy. (Heb. xii. 14.)

*Note.—Field, 1, 25, 26.* There are some who profess the truth, but not wholly and entirely, as heretics; some the whole saving truth, but not in unity, as schismatics; some the whole saving truth in unity, but not in sincerity, and singleness of a good and sanctified mind, as hypocrites and wicked men, not outwardly divided from the people of GOD; and some that profess the whole saving truth in unity, and sincerity of a good and sanctified heart. All these are partakers of the heavenly calling, and sanctified by the profession of the truth, and consequently are in some degree and sort of that society of men whom GOD calleth out unto Himself, and separateth from infidels, which is rightly named the Church.

704. **Q.** How is it evident that the Church, when said to be holy, must yet be a visible society?

**A.** The Church must be a visible society; for how else could CHRIST's commands be observed, "Tell it unto the Church?" No attention is therefore to be paid to those who say the Church when affirmed to be holy, must be invisible.

705. **Q.** But as many members of the Church live unholly lives, is it not wrong to call the Church on earth holy?

**A.** The sound members of the Body of CHRIST do not lose their glorious titles, gifts, and inheritance purchased by CHRIST's Blood, by reason of

the disorders of the unsound and ill-affected members, and therefore the whole body of the Church is spoken of in Scripture as a communion of saints or holy persons. (Col. i. 2; Eph. i. 1.)

*Illustration.*—A man's limbs, and even body, are covered with sores, but it would be wrong to proclaim the heart and head as consequently unsound. We do not refuse an apple tree its claim to be a fruit tree, because there are many fruitless branches on it.

706. Q. But since CHRIST speaks of presenting to Himself a glorious Church in heaven without spot or wrinkle, (Eph. v. 27,) may not this be part of the Church only to which the attribute "holy" is to be applied?

A. No; for in the same place He is expressly said to have sanctified or made holy His Church by the washing of water, i.e., by baptism, which must certainly be meant of the visible, as well as the invisible Church of CHRIST.

707. Q. Ought we to consider a Church, or any member of a Church, which errs in living and in matters of faith to be holy?

A. If holy only means pure, such a Church is not holy. But if it also means separate or dedicate to GOD,—it is in that sense holy. There is a relative holiness of men, places, and communions. So S. Paul says the unbelieving husband is sanctified or made holy by the believing wife. 1 Cor. vii.

708. Q. Mention from Scripture a prophet, a priest, and some Churches, holy in respect to office, but wicked in their action.

**A.** Balaam, Aaron, Judas, Sardis, (Rev. iii. 1,) Laodicea. (Rev. iii. 14, 15.)

709. **Q.** But how is it that an unholv man is allowed to be a member of the Body of CHRIST?

**A.** It is GOD's nature to show mercy and forbearance ; and we must leave it to His wisdom to judge when the decaying and mortifying member can be no longer allowed to keep its place with safety to the body.

It is false that Bellarmine affirmeth that we require inward qualities to make a man to be of the Church, thereby making it unknown who are that Church, to whose authority and direction the LORD commandeth us to submit ourselves. For we do not require inward qualities in a man before he can be at all of the Church ; but before he can be fully and of the mystical body of CHRIST. *Field*, 1, 38.

710. **Q.** What similitudes or parables of our Blessed SAVIOUR show that in His kingdom militant on earth, we were to expect that the evil should ever be mingled with the good ?

**A.** Good seed and tares. S. Matt. xiii. 24—30. The sower. S. Matt. xiii. 2—10. The net. S. Matt. xiii. 47. The virgins. S. Matt. xxv. 1—12. The talents. S. Matt. xxv. 14—30. Floor of wheat and chaff. S. Matt. iii. 12. Some having the wedding garment, and some not. S. Matt. xxii. 11—14. In other parts of Scripture also, clean and unclean in the ark. Gen. vii. 2. Great house, containing many different vessels, 2 Tim. ii. 20, in which those are that walk according to the rule

of Christianity, Phil. iii. 16, 17, and worthy of God, 1 Thess. ii. 12, and others that walk inordinately, 2 Thess. iii. 11. *Refer to Catechism Explained*, pp. 24, 25. *See also Art. xxvi.*

711. Q. As there are, it appears, divers ranks of men, sanctified by the profession of saving truth and the heavenly calling, by what names do you distinguish them?

A. *Field*, 1, 26. As the name of the Church doth distinguish men that have received the revelation of supernatural truth, from infidels; and the Christian Church, Christians from Jews; so the orthodox Church is applied to distinguish rightly believing Christians from heretics; the Catholic Church men holding the faith in unity from schismatics; the invisible Church "the Church of the first born, whose names are written in heaven;" the mystical body of CHRIST to distinguish the elect from all the rest.

712. Q. What is Field's judgment on a final review of this question?

A. 1, 26. That all they whom the grace of GOD in any sort calleth out from the world to the use of the precious means of salvation must needs be of the Church.

713. Q. What sect taught anciently contrary to the doctrine that the Church, though containing both kinds, may yet be called holy?

A. The Novatians, who were called Cathari the Pure. Novatian asserted that those who had fallen from the faith were never to be again received into the Church, though they did not exclude them from all hopes of salvation.

714. Q. What is the duty arising out of this Article?

A. Follow after holiness. Heb. xii. 14; 1 S. Pet. i. 15, 16.

715. Q. If there are some who, although in the Church and also of it, in that they have fellowship in some outward things with the chosen servants of God, yet principally, fully, and absolutely are not of it, what distinction appears to arise?

A. That of a visible and invisible Church.

716. Q. Would this then constitute two separate Churches?

A. *Field*, 1, 31. Not to make two distinct Churches, but to distinguish the several points of view in which the same Church may be regarded; visible in respect of the revelation of supernatural truths, holy sacraments, an ordained ministry, and an obedient people, yet in respect of the most precious effects of saving grace invisible.

*Note.*—They that in so happy, generous things have communion among themselves are not discernible from others to whom this fellowship is denied, but are known only unto God. That Nathanael was an Israelite all men knew; that he was a “true Israelite, in whom was no guile,” CHRIST only knew. Hooker, iii. ch. 1, § 2.

The Church must be visible. “No man can be saved unless he make confession unto salvation, (for faith hid in the heart and concealed doth not suffice,) it cannot be but they that are of the true Church, must by the profession of the truth make themselves known in such sort, that by their profession and practice they may be discerned from other men.” Yet sometimes errors and heresies

so much prevail, that the most part depart from the soundness of Christian faith, so that the truth is defended by only some few, and they persecuted as enemies to the common peace of the Christian world. In this sense the Church is said sometimes to be invisible, not because there are none seen, or known to profess the truth; but because even in that company which is the true Church of God, many and those the greatest are carried into error, so that but some few are left to defend the same; multitude and authority of others so obscuring them that they which measure things by outward appearance can take no notice of them. This was the state of the Christian world in the time of Athanasius, when in the Council of Seleucia and Ariminum the Nicene faith was condemned; and all the Bishops of the whole world fell from the soundness of the faith, only Athanasius excepted, and some few confessors called Athanasians. So Jerome writes, "the world poured forth sighs, marvelling how it was become an Arian." And it was then that S. Hilary said, "It is not well that you are in love with evil, that you esteem the Church in respect of houses and buildings, and in and under those shows and outward appearances urge the name of peace. Is there any doubt of Antichrist's sitting in those places? Mountains, deep pits, and devouring gulfs, seem to me to be more safe." *Field, Bk. i. 9.*

*The Church Catholic.*

717. Q. What is the meaning of the word Catholic?

A. The word Catholic (*κατά* according to *οὐλος*

whole) means universal or general, i. e., diffused throughout the whole. *Wordsworth, Th. Ang. 5.*

In the Te Deum, "the Holy Church throughout the world." The Epistles are called 'general.' In the Prayer for Church Militant, 'Universal Church.' In the Litany, 'the Holy Church Universal.' In the Prayer for all conditions of Men, 'We pray for the good estate of the Catholic Church.' So in Catechism 'generally (not meaning ordinarily, but 'universally'), necessary to salvation.' Besides being used in the Apostles' Creed, it is used in the Nicene Creed, 'One Catholic and Apostolic Church ;' and in the Athanasian, 'to hold the Catholic faith.' 'This is the Catholic faith.' It is thus undeniable that the Church of England never intended to dispense with the use of this word.

It must be remembered that Protestant is nowhere used in the Book of Common Prayer, and though useful in contradistinction to the word Romanist, yet being only a negative term it does not profess to declare what the truth is, but what it is not.

718. Q. Why is the Church called Catholic or Universal?

A. The Church is called Catholic because, while diffused throughout all nations, it is everywhere, and in all times, the same ; and preserves in it, as distinguished from all schismatical bodies, the Catholic faith or the belief held by all the faithful everywhere and in all ages.

Inquiring of many excellent, holy, and learned men (says Vincentius of Lerins,) how and by what means, I might assuredly, and, by some general way, discern the true Catholic faith from false

and wicked heresy ; I had answer to them all, that whether I or any other desired to find out the fraud of heretics and willingly would continue in a sound faith, he ought, by GOD's assistance, to defend the faith in two ways ; that is, first, by the authority of the law of GOD ; secondly, by the wisdom of the Catholic Church.

Now, within the Catholic Church, we hold that which hath been believed *everywhere, always, and of all men* ; for that is truly and properly Catholic which comprehends all things in general after an universal manner. And that we do in following *universality, antiquity, consent*. *Universality* we follow, if we profess that one faith to be true, which the whole Church throughout the world acknowledgeth. *Antiquity*, if we part not any whit from those senses which it is plain that our holy elders and fathers generally held. *Consent*, if, in this way antiquity itself, we hold the definitions and opinions of all, or at any rate almost all, the priests and doctors together. *Beveridge*.

Quod ubique—i.e., universality—what is and has been received *everywhere as the faith* ; by which is not meant that in every single country where the Christian religion is planted must, of necessity, be found the pure faith ; but that that which is the most universally received teaching wherever Christianity is preached must be true. Nor indeed, as if it were meant, for a maxim which might be tried on any one given period ; for, at some one particular time, the greatest number of professing Christians may be involved in the direst heresy. No criterion would be gathered from any single period ; for, however flourishing and prosperous a novel doctrine and its followers have been, it ordinarily lasts but for a time, as *Donatism, Arianism, &c.* What is re-

ceived must have the sanction of all ages as well as all places. Neither has the Church of Rome any right to claim this character for herself, because of her wide-spread dominion, for it must be remembered, that however diffused it is now, it yet is not universal; neither was it generally acknowledged in the early ages of the Church as the head of all others, but even the universal power of any single Bishop was emphatically denied by one of her own Popes.

Quod semper—antiquity—what was *always* from the Apostles' days the well-ascertained doctrine of the Church, so that anything new was rejected simply because new—the monuments of Councils and other ecclesiastical memorials with the writings of holy men of the Church testifying to what was the true doctrine. It is clear that those who were nearer to the time of CHRIST and His Apostles would know what was committed to them both on doctrine and practice, and would be competent witnesses, and as successive ages verified their testimony, the harmony of consent becomes more forcible and hence—

Quod ab omnibus. As it is plain that what had been agreed to in all times, and everywhere, would be of great force;—hence another law. Beveridge says—

It hath been so ordered by the most wise and merciful providence of Almighty GOD, that from the very times of the Apostles even unto these our own times, there is no age whose ecclesiastical memorials are not preserved to us. From which memorials accordingly we are enabled to conceive a perfect idea of the Universal Church, and to feel assured and certain, what has through all ages been admitted and what rejected; what rites and doctrines have prevailed, what heresies

and schisms have been disapproved and condemned. Finally, from these and these alone, we may see on what points of doctrine and discipline agreement hath ever prevailed among all Churches, and on what again controversy hath existed between them, and consequently what is more and what less, necessary to be believed and observed. For whatever is to be said of other things, those things at any rate in which all Churches everywhere have agreed, cannot but be most certain, and necessary, even at this very time, to be retained by all. *Beveridge, Introduction to Vincentius.*

719. Q. Does not the Church of Rome claim to be the alone Catholic Church?

A. The claim of the Church of Rome to be the alone Catholic Church cannot be proved, because it is not, nor ever has been, the only Church preserving within it the Catholic faith and Catholic communion. That she has not been everywhere and in all ages the alone Catholic Church is a clear historical fact. See Q. 698.

Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man. Art. ix. The Church of Rome, being but a several Church, challenging that name of Catholic above all other, doth great wrong to all other Churches and doeth only by force support an unjust usurpation; for that Church hath no more right to that name than the Churches of France, Spain, England, or Portugal, which be justly called Catholic Churches.

No particular Church *can be the* Catholic Church any more than a branch is a tree, or a hand is the whole body. *Wordsworth, Theop. Angl. 7.*

720. *Q.* Show the difference between a Catholic Church and the Catholic Church.

*A.* It is the difference which exists between *a* Church and *the* Church—between a part and the whole. The Church of Rome affirms herself to be *the* Church and the Catholic Church, but being only a branch or part of the Universal or Catholic Church of CHRIST, we should be erring against the truth to admit her claims.

721. *Q.* And does it appear that the Church of England teaches as necessary to salvation what has always been taught in the Catholic Church of CHRIST?

*A.* It is plain to all men that in the Church of England the same means of grace, to fit men for salvation, are to be found, as ever have been, in the Church of CHRIST, viz., Baptism, Absolution, Confirmation, the Holy Communion, Benediction, Consecration and Ordination by Bishops. Our Church appeals also constantly to the consistent voice of Catholic antiquity for proof of her doctrines.

Canon of 1571 concerning preachers, which Bishop Cosin calls the golden rule of the Church of England. "In the first place preachers are to take care that they never teach anything in their discourses to be religiously held and believed by the people, but that which is agreeable with the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and which, from that very doctrine, the Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops have collected."

722. *Q.* What do you mean by Catholic Antiquity?

**A.** I mean that a body of ancient Catholic writers, acknowledging communion of sentiment, generation after generation, while differing in matters unessential, have handed down one uniform testimony as to all the doctrines necessary to salvation.

**723. Q.** How does the Church make her voice known, and her influence felt in her corporate capacity, or as an ecclesia?

**A.** The Church meets in representative councils. Such was the first assembly of the Church under S. James, Bishop of Jerusalem, and such were the famous six general councils, of which Nice was the first.

**724. Q.** May councils err?

**A.** Though under the influence and guidance of the HOLY GHOST councils may err.

**725. Q.** If this be the case, how can Christians obey their injunctions?

**A.** Though some feature or features in the doctrine of a particular council may be faulty, that does not relieve us from the duty of obedience. Though we may dissent in opinion, yet for the general good we should allow, as far as the obligation to action is concerned in any particular point, our private opinion to be overruled, until the judgment of a future council may be taken.

**726. Q.** But I thought the four first or six first general councils were received as of almost absolute authority?

**A.** Their authority was confirmed by the general voice of the concurrent Church receiving them, and by the Church in subsequent ages always rendering the homage of its submission to their decrees. This

ordeal must always be gone through to confirm the validity of a Church's decrees; but the value of them, even if afterwards rescinded, is of no mean importance, if for the time a judicial sentence on certain points in dispute is given, and the peace of the Church secured.

727. Q. Are there such councils in England?

A. As in every other diocese of the Catholic Church the bishops have the power of calling synods of their clergy, whose voices taken, may, with the voices of the clergy of all other dioceses similarly collected, be presented by their respective bishops and other representatives of the priesthood in a national synod—so it is in England. The bishops have power of summoning diocesan synods, and the representation of the whole Church of England meets in two convocations of the bishops and clergy—the provinces of Canterbury and of York respectively.

728. Q. Has not the Church of Rome claimed for its Pope the power of teaching infallibly, thus rendering councils unnecessary?

A. The Pope would never have attempted to lord it over men's faith and actions but for the extraordinary political aspect of affairs in the middle ages which rendered the institution at that time particularly useful to Christendom. See *Southey's admission. Brit. Crit. 1824, 25, 378.*

### *The Church Apostolical.*

729. Q. What is the derivation of the word Apostolical?

*A.* Ἀποστέλλω, apostello, hence apostle, or one sent.

730. Q. Why is the Church called apostolical?

*A.* Because it is built upon the Apostles, (see supra, 665 Q., Eph. ii. 20,) as sent or commissioned by our LORD, Who was Himself sent by GOD. S. John xvii. 3.

731. Q. Should this idea that our Blessed LORD was sent by God be very prominently kept in view?

*A.* Yes. He is the Apostle and Bishop of our souls. See Th. Ang. 97; Heb. iii. 1; 1 S. Pet. ii. 25; Acts x. 38; S. Luke iii. 22.

732. Q. What is the form of the commission to them?

*A.* He breathed upon them the HOLY GHOST, and said, As My FATHER hath sent Me, even so send I you. S. John xx. 21.

733. Q. What do you understand by this commission?

*A.* That as the FATHER gave the SON power of succession, so in like manner He gave His Apostles power to send others also with a like commission of succession for the perpetual continuance of the ministry to the end of time.

734. Q. With what powers was their commission authenticated?

*A.* 1. With a commission of succession, i.e., to send others, called the Apostolic succession. S. John xvii. 18.

2. To transmit the Word of GOD. 2 Tim. i. 13; Eph. iii. 5; S. John xvii. 8, 14.

3. To transmit Divine power of grace. 1 Tim.

i. 11 ; 2. Tim. ii. 2 ; S. John xvii. 2, 22, received on Day of Pentecost. Acts i. 8 ; 1 Tim. iv. 14 ; 2 Tim. i. 14.

735. Q. Did the first Christians exhibit an adherence to this rule?

A. Yes, we are expressly told that they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine (*τὴ διδαχὴ*, the teaching, i.e., that handed down, committed to them, 2 Tim. vi. 20,) and fellowship (*τὴ κοινωνία*, their communion and consequently succession), and in breaking of bread (Holy Eucharist), and prayers (*τὰς προσευχὰς*, the appointed liturgical forms). Acts ii. 42.

736. Q. Show how this apostolical commission was continued.

A. First by appointment of S. Matthias, Acts i. 25, afterwards by S. Barnabas and S. Paul.

737. Q. How would you know any branch of the Church to be at this day apostolic?

A. The true Church of CHRIST is every where known at this day, as at the first, by its continuance in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship. The Apostles received full authority to make disciples (*μαθητεύειν*) of all nations, baptizing them, &c., &c., and further received a complete sum of doctrine from the first, being commanded to teach their disciples to the end of the world through their successors, to observe all things that CHRIST had commanded them. S. Matt. xxviii. 20.

738. Q. Was it then necessary to be strict in preserving Apostolic fellowship and doctrine in these early times?

**A.** It was quite necessary to preserve unity, S. Jude 11, Rom. xvi. 17, and to keep to the form of sound words, for even in those days when the Apostles worked miracles in proof of their mission, and when men had before their eyes the moving power of their holy example, some there were who taught new and wicked doctrines. As Hermogenes, Phy�ellus, and with them all in Asia, turned away, 2 Tim. i. 15; Hymenaeus and Alexander, 1 Tim. i. 19, 20; 2 S. John 7; Hymenaeus and Philetus, 2 Tim. ii. 17; Simon Magus, Acts viii. 23; Nicolaitanes, Rev. ii. 6.

739. Q. Were there then disputings in those days even as now?

**A.** S. Paul had often need of reminding the first Christians of their duty to speak all the same thing, and to suffer no divisions among them. 1 Cor. i. 10.

740. Q. How then do we proceed to prove that we at this day hold to the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship?

**A.** We endeavour to learn whether we belong to that one body with which our SAVIOUR promised to be unto the end of the world, S. Matt. xxviii. 22, against whom the gates of hell shall not prevail, and whether we hold that "one faith" which shall endure throughout all ages.

741. Q. What are the marks by which the one body and one faith may be known, and by which we satisfy ourselves that we at this day hold to the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship?

**A.** 1. The rulers of this body must be successors of the Apostles. 2. The true faith will be

always discerned by proof that it is such doctrine as the Apostles and their successors have always taught in all ages.

Art. xix., "in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to CHRIST's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."

742. *Q.* How do the rulers and teachers in the Christian body prove that they are true successors of the Apostles?

*A.* A ruler or teacher to prove that he is a duly commissioned successor to the Apostles, must be able to show that he has received the laying on of hands, (1 Tim. v. 22; Tit. i. 6,) from one himself a successor of the Apostles. *See Art. xxiii.; also Art. xxxvi. See also Ordination Service.*

743. *Q.* What was the form used by our LORD for conveying this succession?

*A.* He breathed on the Apostles, and said, Receive ye the HOLY GHOST. S. John xx. 22.

744. *Q.* Why was this altered to laying on of hands if the power imparted was the same?

*A.* Perhaps the Apostles altered the practice in reverence, as not liking to use the same channel of grace as our SAVIOUR; and also because it seemed to make the grace personal to the party breathing. We may further suppose that the Apostles had been instructed by CHRIST how to displace it by a ceremonial more indicative of the transmitted nature of the gift.

745. *Q.* And is there historical proof that this has always been done?

*A.* Besides the Scripture proof in the instances of S. Matthias, S. Paul, S. Barnabas, Timothy and Titus, we know that there was not any time from the Apostles when the order of Bishops was not continued by spiritual succession.

*Preface to Form and Manner of Ordaining Deacons, Priests, and Bishops.* For the first 1500 years after CHRIST, there was never any body of Christians without a Bishop.

*Illustration.*—The last Bishop is united to the first, like the links in a chain which, however long, has its last link joined unto the first.

Grotius, by birth and education a Presbyterian, writes, "That the Episcopate was sanctioned by Divine law, the Apocalypse affords an irrefragable argument."

"No Church without a Bishop" has been a fact as well as a maxim since the time of Tertullian and Irenæus. *Gibbon, Rom. Hist.*, ch. xv.

We require you to find out one Church upon the face of the whole earth that hath not been ordained by Episcopal Regiment since the time that the Blessed Apostles were here conversant. *Hooker, Pref.* iv. 1.

Even heretics and schismatics, differing from each other, agreed in recognising the necessity of Episcopal Government, with one single exception, that of Aerius (of Sebastia in Pontus) in the fourth century, who is placed among heretics, and whose doctrine on that point was condemned by the Church as sacrilegious. *Th. Ang.* 99.

Leo the Great says, It was never heard that Presbyters could ordain Presbyters or Deacons, much less Bishops.

The opinion of the Primitive Church in this matter will be put beyond dispute, if we compare the judgment concerning Ischyras, who was ordained by one Coluthus, a mere Presbyter, with that about the Presbyters ordained by Meletius, a schismatical Bishop. The latter having been ordained by one who had the episcopal character, were received as Presbyters without being re-ordained; whereas Ischyras having received his orders from one who had not power to give them, was reckoned as a mere layman. *Potter, W. T. A.* 103.

746. Q. You said that the true faith will be always discerned by proof that it is such doctrine as the Apostles and their successors have taught in all ages. Is it easy to discern what this doctrine is?

A. Yes, for no heresy has ever lasted long without refutation in the Church, whereas the Apostolic Faith is known by its permanence. All schismatical and heretical bodies have sooner or later a tendency to die out, whereas the Apostolical Succession is preserved by the special blessing of GOD.

The perpetuity of the fellowship. *S. Matt. xxviii. 20.*

The perpetuity of the teaching. *2 Tim. ii. 2.*

Certain heretical Churches have, however, an Apostolical succession. *Neale's Eastern Church*, vol. ii. *passim*.

747. Q. May not a person then of his own accord take upon himself the office of preaching God's Word, and administering the Sacraments?

**A.** No. Art. xxiii. What S. Paul said of the ministers of religion under the Jewish dispensation has never been repealed, and therefore applies with full force to the ministers of religion under the Christian,—“No man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of GOD, as was Aaron.” Heb. v. 4.

All opposers or dissenters in this respect have the highest exemplar.

CHRIST glorified not Himself, &c. Heb. v. 5. See Numb. xvi. 32—34; 1 Chron. xiii. 10; 2 Chron. xxvi. 16, 19.

748. **Q.** If Aaron was called by GOD, why may not a person who believes that he has a Divine call take upon him this function?

**A.** Because a man may be mistaken, in supposing himself called by GOD. Aaron was not only called by GOD, but at GOD’s express command to Moses, was visibly ordained by him. Exodus xxviii.; Romans x. 15. *Quoted from W. T. A., 81.*

749. **Q.** Have any other bodies in England but the Church of England, the marks of a true succession?

**A.** None, if we except the Church of Rome, which at first appointed only a Mission Church, with an Archpriest at its head, A.D. 1598; afterwards Bishops “in partibus infidelium,” A.D. 1623; and finally, A.D. 1851, a hierarchy.

The Commission of a Vicar Apostolic was only during the Pope’s pleasure. The Bishops in England were thus made more dependent on Rome than those in Ireland.

The Roman Church, from whatever reason, did not establish a full Episcopal Church until 1851, when it first set up altar against altar, Church against Church, and perfected that schism which at first she hesitated to perpetrate.

The Popes of Rome, Paul IV. and Pius IV., offered to confirm the Book of Common Prayer if Queen Elizabeth would acknowledge the Pope's supremacy ; and Roman Catholics in these realms habitually conformed to the worship of the Church of England for the first twelve years of Queen Elizabeth's reign, after which time they were prevented from doing so by the bull of Pius V., A.D. 1569, which excommunicated that Sovereign. *Wordsworth, Th. Ang. 222. See also Bramhall, i. 248.*

750. Q. But may not Christians appoint their own spiritual teachers, and adopt their own plan of Church government ?

A. No ; for when GOD appoints a way to obtain a blessing, it is presumptuous and sinful to seek it in any other way. GOD has given pastors and teachers, and the humble Christian will therefore hear them.

751. Q. What must we make up our minds however to see in the Church ?

A. That men will depart from the faith of the Apostles, and set at nought their rules and practices, we are warned in Scripture. Even the authority and personal character of S. Paul did not secure him from being despised and spoken against. When therefore we observe such things, we should not despond, but receive them rather as another and additional evidence of the truth of GOD's Word.

*The Communion of Saints.*

752. *Q.* Who are the Saints here spoken of?

*A.* Members of the Church of CHRIST, to whom, on account of their union with it, (see Q. 669,) the character of sanctity or holiness belongs.

753. *Q.* Does this character of holiness exist alike in all?

*A.* No; it differs in those who possess it, both in quality and degree.

754. *Q.* Explain how it differs in quality and degree.

*A.* The quality of holiness is both outward and inward, and in different persons inward holiness manifests itself in greater degrees according to their Christian attainments.

755. *Q.* In what way does outward holiness arise?

*A.* In separation of things and persons from a profane to a divine use, as was the case under the Law.

*Note.*—The people of Israel are spoken of as holy unto God, although stiff-necked and rebellious.

756. *Q.* And are Christians separated in like manner?

*A.* All the baptised members of the Church are addressed as Saints in the Epistles. (Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 2, &c. ;) and as by baptism every one is separated from the rest of the world unto a life of holiness, all such separation is a kind of sanctification.

757. Q. On what higher ground do you consider those who have been received into the Church to be holy?

A. Because they have been, by the HOLY GHOST, sanctified in baptism, and so long as they preserve the grace therein imparted, or when having lost it, they have recovered it by penitence, they are still holy.

Regenerated, washed and sanctified. 1 S. John v. 1; Tit. iii. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 11; Eph. i. 13.

758. Q. But do not many seem as if their baptism had produced in them no sanctifying effect?

A. Though, in some cases, the work of grace be not always perfectly wrought, or be but slightly manifest, we ought rather to presume it dormant, than altogether absent. (See also Q. 705.)

759. Q. Who realize this inward quality of sanctity in themselves in a fuller degree?

A. Those are more truly Saints, who, having been sanctified by the HOLY SPIRIT, lead by His influence a holy life, perfecting holiness in the fear of the LORD. (1 S. Pet. i, 15; 2 S. Pet. i. 5, 8; 2 Cor. vii. 1.)

760. Q. Do the Saints of GOD have any communion with those who are not truly Saints?

A. While the hypocrite communicates in the same Christian privileges, he does not communicate with the Saint in the same saving grace. The Saint may communicate with the wicked, but does not communicate in his wickedness.

*Pearson.*

761. *Q.* Were there any Saints under the Old Testament dispensation?

*A.* Ps. lxxxix. 5, 7; Deut. xxxiii. 3; Dan. vii. 25; S. Matt. xxvii. 52, 53.

762. *Q.* What is the difference between the Saints of the Old and New Testament?

*A.* Great as respects privileges. S. John the Baptist was greater than any of the prophets; yet the least in the kingdom of heaven, as a member of CHRIST and His Church, was greater than he. The Saints under the whole Testament possessed no communion of Saints, and no sustained spiritual life by the impartation of the HOLY GHOST.

763. *Q.* What do you conclude from the fact that at the Crucifixion, as mentioned in S. Matt. xxvii. 52, the "bodies of the Saints which slept arose?"

*A.* First, that they were Saints, while even the bodies were still in their graves. (So Aaron, called the Saint of the LORD, Ps. cvi. 16,) such as were holy in their course of life, not losing their sanctity in the unseen state.

Secondly, that there are with our SAVIOUR, in His glorified state, some beings, who in their bodies have already received their reward.

*Note.*—Of these, Enoch and Elijah would represent those whose souls had never been separated from the body, but were changed, as S. Paul describes "the quick," at the resurrection, 1 Cor. xv.

764. *Q.* What distinction is brought to our notice by these facts?

*A.* That of the diverse state of the Saints of

the Church Militant, and those of the Church Triumphant.

Of the first. Ps. xv. 1—3; xcvi. 10—12; cxxxii. 9; 1 Cor. vi. 1. Saints on earth.

Of the second. 1 Cor. vi. 2; Dan. vii. 21, 22; S. Jude 14; 1 Thess. ii. 10; Rev. iii. 21; xx. 4, 5, 12—15. The Saints shall judge the world.

Again. Rev. vii. 9—17; xi. 18; xiv. 12, 13; xxi. 1, 4, 23, 27. The final triumph of the Saints.

765. Q. Will all those who are Saints on earth be hereafter Saints in heaven?

A. All who, in this life, being truly such, persevere to the end in holiness, shall hereafter be Saints in heaven.

766. Q. In what consists the Communion of the Saints?

A. 1. In that union which subsists between all the members of the Church, whether outward, in all holding and acknowledging one Head; (Eph. iv. 3; Col. ii. 19;) or inward, in all having been made to drink into that one Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 13; 1 S. John i. 3,) the onflowing of whose graces creates such a subtle vein of sympathy throughout the Christian body, that what one member suffers, all the members suffer.

2. In that communication which Christians have amongst themselves of those spiritual goods or graces, which are the property of the Church. 1 S. John i. 7.

*Note.—They walk by the same rule, mind the same thing, reverence the same pastors and teachers, pray for each other in the same prayers,*

and obtain help for each other in time of need. Rom. xv. 26; 1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 1—4.

There was a time, and it is pleasing to look back to it, when a Christian furnished with proper credentials from his bishop, might travel through the whole world, from east to west, and from north to south, and be received to communion with his brethren in any part of the globe then known. *Bishop Horne's Sermon on Christian Unity.*

3. In the obligation to impart a communion of earthly goods to them that are of the household of faith, i.e., to the Saints.

*Note.*—The same principle involved in our Saviour's promise of reward for a cup of cold water to a disciple in the name of a disciple.

767. Q. What are those spiritual good things or graces you were just mentioning?

A. The more prominent are, 1. The privilege of assembling ourselves in public worship. 2. The receiving remission of sins on our confession and repentance. 3. The hearing the Word of God authoritatively read and preached. 4. The administration of the Holy Sacraments. 5. The ministry of an appointed and ordained order of men to offer up our prayers to God, and to watch over and instruct and nourish our souls, and continually to intercede for them.

768. Q. Show that the faithful are brought nearer to God and to one another in the Holy Sacraments.

A. God conveys His Spirit by these channels to all the faithful. S. Matt. xviii. 20; 1 Cor.

x. 16; Gal. v. 5; Rom. viii. 13, 26; 1 S. Pet. i. 22.

*Note.*—“GOD, by vouchsafing to feed us in the Holy Mysteries with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, assures us that we are very members incorporate in the mystical Body of His SON, which is the blessed company of all faithful people,” both those who are departed and those who are still militant on earth. Wherefore in the Eucharistic Office we not only intercede for our brethren in the flesh, but commemorate also those who have passed the barriers of death; and knowing that “they without us shall not be made perfect;” we pray for admission together into glory “that we with them may be made partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom.”

*Holy Oblation.*

From the Homilies. “As he (S. Augustine) witnesseth in another place, the martyrs and holy men in times past were wont after their death to be remembered and named of the priest at the Divine Service, but never to be invocated or called upon.” S. Cyril says, “We make mention also of those who are before departed, first of the patriarchs, prophets, Apostles, and martyrs, that by their entreaties and intercession, GOD may receive our prayers.” *S. Cyr. Cat. Myst.* v. c. 9, quoted in *Holy Oblation*.

769. Q. What passages of Scripture speak of the union of the faithful with GOD?

A. 1. The FATHER, 1 S. John i. 3; 2 S. Pet. i. 4. 2. The SON, S. John i. 16; xvii. 20, 23; Phil. iii. 10. 3. The HOLY GHOST, Rom. viii. 9, 15; 1 Cor. iii. 16; Gal. iv. 6, 7.

770. Q. How do the Saints hold communion with one another?

A. As by the HOLY SPIRIT they have been baptised into one body (Eph. iv. 25) the Church of CHRIST, and have fellowship with the FATHER, and the SON, so are they necessarily every one members one of another. (1 Cor. xii. 13; Heb. xii. 22—24.)

771. Q. What advantages arise from this communion in respect to prayer?

A. The Saints have an interest in the prayers of the Church throughout the world, and not only in those of the congregation in which they worship. *A Catechism of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.*

772. Q. Do you believe that the Saints receive any benefit from such prayers?

A. Yes; for S. Paul bids the Churches strive together in their prayers for him, and ascribes his deliverance to their prayers, and many examples in Scripture show that GOD especially regards the united prayers of the Church. Acts xii. 5—12; 2 Cor. i. 10, 11.

773. Q. Do angels have any share in this Communion of Saints?

A. They have a constant and perpetual relation to the children of GOD. Angels were present at CHRIST's Annunciation and Birth, at His Temptation, and in His agony, carried Lazarus into Abraham's bosom, brought the Apostles forth from prison, rejoice over the penitent, are to sever the wicked from the just. Heb. i. 14.

In the celebration of Holy Communion, by a pious opinion, the holy angels are thought to be present. "With angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify," &c. "In this giving of thanks by CHRIST our LORD, the priest prayeth to be joined and associate with the angels and archangels, and all the whole army of the blessed spirits in heaven, who then do assist the priest, and be present there in the honour of Him Who is offered, praising, honouring, and adoring the majesty of Almighty GOD." *Watson's Wholesome Doctrine*, p. 79, quoted in *Holy Oblation*. In King Edward VI.'s First Book there was a prayer that GOD would command our Eucharistic prayers and supplications by the ministry of His holy angels to be brought up into His holy Tabernacle before the sight of His Divine Majesty.

774. Q. Does this Communion only take place between the members of the Church on earth?

A. It is carried on between the members of the Church Militant and also between them and the Saints of the Church triumphant. *Heb. xii. 23.*

*Note.* — Since the spiritual conjunction of CHRIST and His Church, of the members to the Head, is the true foundation, death can make no separation in it. *Pearson.*

775. Q. But as those who have passed into the unseen state have no need of sacraments, how do they have communion with saints who are still in this life?

A. As they only form together one body with the Church Militant, they necessarily share in

the influences and results of the same gifts and graces according to the capacity of each state to receive or impart them. "For the prayers and praises of those who are departed, continually ascend together with those of their fellow-servants and brethren on earth to the throne of God." Rev. vi. 9, 11; xiv. 3, 5; vii. 15. *A Catechism, &c.*

*Note.*—Thus much we know even of saints in heaven, that they pray. (Rev. vi. 9.) And therefore prayer being a work common to the Church as well triumphant as militant, &c. *Hooker*, v. 23. What they do in heaven in relation to us, or what we ought to perform in reference to them, beside a reverential respect and study of imitation, is nowhere revealed in Scripture; the society of hope, esteem and imitation on our side—of desires and supplications on their side is all we can gather. *Pearson.*

Doubtless they increase that communion towards us, by loving and praying for their brethren whom they have left behind them; and we are to increase it towards them not by addressing petitions to them which we are neither authorised to offer, nor have any ground to think that they can bear; but by rejoicing in their happiness, and beseeching the Disposer of all things, that having followed them in holiness here, we may meet them in happiness hereafter, and become, in the fullest sense, fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God, (Eph. ii. 19,) having with all those that are departed in the true faith of His holy Name, our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in His eternal and everlasting glory. *Burial Office. Secker*, 123.

We must account of them as *living members of Christ's Body*, and be not only ready but desirous to go to them whenever it shall please GOD to call for us. We must take care decently to dispose of their bodies, and faithfully to fulfil, as much as in us lies, what they have left in trust with us, to be done for them after their departure. *Wake*, 69.

King James writing by Casaubon to Cardinal Perron: "does not doubt that the saints now reigning with CHRIST assiduously pray for the necessities of the Church, and firmly believes that their prayers are not useless."

And R. Crakanthorp: "We deny not, that S. Jerome, S. Cyprian, and S. Gregory Nazianzen, as well as others also were of that opinion (which we also embrace as pious and probable) that they thought that the Saints departed pour forth prayers to GOD even in particular for some who were formerly known to them and beloved."

R. Montague says: "The holy who have been gathered in to CHRIST in heaven, may as an ordinary thing, commend in prayer their friends, their intimates, their kinsfolk and acquaintances, to GOD the FATHER through CHRIST, and assist them in general in procuring the things necessary to their salvation, treat of averting and removing evils. But this in no degree supports that enormous mass of conduct or doctrine, which now obtains in the Romish Church."

The Scriptures, Isa. lxiii. 16, 1 Kings viii. 39, 2 Kings xxii. 20, teach that it belongs only to GOD and to CHRIST the Mediator, to know the words, deeds and thoughts of all men; to take care of and administer human affairs everywhere; to hear the prayers and groans of all pious persons wherever they may be praying, &c., but

that this gift is communicated to no one, either of angels or of saints departed. From whence also it will clearly appear how weak are the reasonings which are drawn from the angels and from certain of the saints on earth, as Elisha, Daniel, &c., to prove that the saints in heaven know each several thing which is here said, done, or thought by the pious, in places however far asunder, and that either at once, or even successively.

S. Augustine says that the dead cannot by their own nature be present at the affairs of the living, nor know what we are doing, or what we are suffering ;—afterwards they hear from those who by dying go from hence to them ; not indeed every thing, but what they are permitted who are permitted also to remember these things, and what those whom they declare them will be profited by hearing. The dead may also hear somewhat from the angels, who are present at the things which are done here, viz. what He, to Whom all things are subject, judges that any one of them ought to hear. The spirits of the dead may also learn some of the things which are done here, and which it is necessary that they should know, not merely those which are past or present, but even future things through the revelation of the Spirit of God. As it was not all men, but the prophets, while they lived here, who knew, and not even these all things, but only what the Providence of God judged should be revealed to them. *Quoted from Bishop Forbes' Considerationes Modestæ.*

776. Q. How does the Church of Rome maintain that communion is preserved between the departed and the faithful on earth ?

*A.* By the prayers that the latter address to the saints, and the aids which they procure in answer.

777. *Q.* How does the Church of Rome speak of the departed?

*A.* As consisting of the saints and those spirits who are undergoing a purifying fire in purgatory.

778. *Q.* What important doctrine does this teaching confound?

*A.* The doctrine of the separate conditions or abodes of souls—the evil designed to irrevocable torment, the good to eternal happiness,—awaiting the sentence of the great judgment day for the full recompence of reward to be decreed at the union of their spiritualised bodies with their souls.

779. *Q.* What doctrine is a consequence of entertaining that of souls in purgatory?

*A.* That the prayers of the faithful can relieve them thence; and that the supererogatory merits of the saints can be applied to them.

780. *Q.* Is there any truth in this doctrine?

*A.* Holy Scripture represents to us two places for departed souls before the final consignment at the Judgment Day,—the one, Paradise, the place for the penitent thief and for Lazarus, i.e., a place of happiness; and the other, Gehenna, the place in which the rich man lifted up his eyes, being in torment; and of these two, it is said, “betwixt us and you there is a gulf fixed, so that those who would pass from hence to you cannot, neither,” &c. S. Luke xvi. 26. See Q. 513.

781. *Q.* Do you mean to say then that the blessed spirits of the departed are so far pure that

they are not capable of even improvement in this state?

*A.* Capable of improvement, but not of purification, for the soul after death either comes before its Maker cleansed or purified from its sins or not, —there is, consequently, no purgatorial state possible. While any possibility of entrance for the impure into these blessed regions of peace cannot be conceded; yet what is to hinder spirits once there from making improvement, since it is almost contrary to the nature of the spiritual life not to advance in holiness?

*Illustration.*—As the communion of the benefits and privileges of the Church extends wherever the Church extends, so to the Church triumphant in Paradise it must also be conceded; and as the faithful on earth and those received into Paradise are by their prayers mutually beneficial, the one society to the other; so the latter are of necessity susceptible of improvement, while the former are both capable of protection from falling away as well as advancement in grace.

782. Q. What is to be said of that honour which is paid to the Saints in the Church of Rome?

*A.* To pray to any creature with all the outward marks of religious worship, oftentimes in the same words and in the same breath in which we pray to GOD, and that with a confidence that the person so prayed to can answer our desires, is evidently to give to the creature the honour due to the Creator, and cannot be done without the peril of idolatry. *Wake.*

783. *Q.* What practical advantages arise out of the belief of the Communion of Saints?

*A.* 1. No man who has a lively belief that he is a member of the Communion of Saints will carelessly forfeit his privileges, or be indifferent to their preservation. *Col. i. 12; Acts xxvi. 18.*

2. The advantage of knowing and feeling that we are members of so awful a company of the righteous, and the consequent ennobling effect upon our practice. *Heb. xii. 22—4.*

3. The practical recognition and help which it gives to the doctrine of the Resurrection, and the belief of a world of higher interests.

4. The love that Christians are thus enabled to encourage and foster towards one another—promoting charity and all good works.

5. The union which they are enabled to preserve.

“To all who have attained the like precious faith with ourselves, we bear a still nearer relation, as being in a peculiar sense, children of the same FATHER, disciples of the same Master, anointed by the same Spirit, members of the same body. And these things oblige us to the utmost care of preserving by prudent order and mutual forbearance as much unity in the Church, as possibly we can.” *Secker, 121.*

We shall show our disposition to maintain communion in all proper ways, attend on the public instruction, join in the public worship, sacraments, and discipline, which our LORD hath appointed, and keep the whole of them pure from all forbidden and suspicious mysteries; avoid with great care both giving and taking needless offence in respect to those or any matters;

and by all fit means edify one another in love.  
Rom. xiv. 19; Eph. iv. 16. *Secker*, 122.

784. *Q.* What is to be done with those who oppose themselves to the Communion of the Saints?

*A.* Those who obstinately deny the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, or transgress its precepts, ought to be withheld from Christian Communion until they repent them of their error.

785. *Q.* What must we hope concerning those who renounce communicating with others willing to admit them to communion on lawful terms?

*A.* We doubt not that CHRIST will own them on both sides to belong to His Church, who through pardonable passions and mistakes are unnaturally alienated from each other.

786. *Q.* What are the means by which persons are held in union so as to prevent a breach of this doctrine of the Communion of the Saints?

*A.* As upon our SAVIOUR's commission to His Apostles when He breathed upon and gave them the HOLY GHOST, the Communion of the Saints is based, it is plain that unless we are of the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, we cannot be of the Communion of the Saints.

787. *Q.* But the Apostles do not exist now; to whom then must we look for this fellowship or communion and unity in doctrine?

*A.* To the Bishops, whom they appointed and empowered to succeed them in their places.

788. *Q.* What inference do you draw from this?

*A.* That, this being proved, any separation

from Episcopal communion must be fatal to those who abet it, and a contradiction and opposition to the duty and obligation implied in their belief of the Article, The Communion of Saints.

789. Q. What question must then for the complete illustration of the Communion of Saints be now entered upon?

A. That of the communion or fellowship of the Apostles, obliging us to a consideration of those orders of the ministry, which visibly represent that communion.

790. Q. What are those orders?

A. Bishops, priests and deacons.

S. Ignat. ad Trall. iii. Let all reverence the Deacons as JESUS CHRIST; and the Bishop as the FATHER; and the Presbyters as the sanhedrim of GOD, and college of the Apostles. Without these there is no Church.

Sotio, the Deacon, in whom I rejoice, forasmuch as he is subject unto his Bishop as to the grace of GOD, and to the Presbytery as to the law of JESUS CHRIST. Ign. ad Magn. 1. Ibid. 7, ad Magn. Do nothing without your Bishop and Presbyters.

791. Q. Is there any, and what peculiar distinction between the Apostles and those who succeeded to their authority in the Church under the title of Bishop?

A. The Apostles as regards power and order were one and the same with Bishops, but were different from Bishops in three respects; 1. They were pillars of the Church (Gal. ii. 9) the Church having them for foundation-stones. Upon their

first teaching and witness to the truth, as the foundation, depended the perfection and beauty of the superstructure. *Hooker*, vii. chap. iv. 4. 2. The Apostles were sent by CHRIST Himself. (See Q. 729, 30.) To the eleven were added S. Matthias, S. Paul and S. Barnabas, who were favoured with especial calls and set apart by the HOLY GHOST. (Acts i. 26; ix. 15; xiii. 2; xiv. 14.) 3. Generally, the Apostles were not limited to any appointed province or region for the exercise of their episcopate, while Bishops were appointed to fixed dioceses.

The Apostles were Missionary Founders, and Bishops of Churches were directed, or restrained in their movements by the HOLY GHOST; (Acts xiii. 2, 4; xvi. 6, 7, 9; xix. 21;) while Bishops were appointed to fixed dioceses, as S. Timothy to Ephesus, Titus to Crete. *Hooker*, vii., chap. iv. 3.

**792. Q. Did the Apostles then institute the office of Bishop?**

**A.** No; for there was but one commission, that given by our LORD, "As My FATHER hath sent Me, so send I you," &c. And the essential permanent functions of Apostle and Bishop were the same.

All Bishops are successors to the Apostles.  
*S. Jerome.*

Bishops are presidents, who succeed by vicarious ordination to the Apostles. *S. Cyprian*, Ep. 66. W. T. A.

**793. Q. What is the office of a Bishop?**

**A.** It is the office of the Bishop to rule the

Church, to pronounce the higher sentences against those who offend against her laws or the brethren; to consecrate others to succeed them as Bishops, to ordain priests and deacons, and to confirm with the **HOLY GHOST** those who have in Baptism before entered upon their spiritual life and privileges.

794. *Q.* Does this seem to agree with the qualifications of a Bishop in S. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians? (2 Cor. v. 11—21.)

*A.* This place evidently describes the duties of the priests or presbyters *ἱερεῖς* or *πρεσβύτεροι*, who were only *episcopi* (*ἐπισκόποι*), to the limited extent of having the spiritual charge of a district or a parish, similar to that given to those in priests' orders now.

Bishop and Presbyter sometimes designated the same person, who was called *episcopus* from his office, and *presbyter* from his age and dignity. W. T. A. 90.

795. *Q.* Why then did not the presbyters retain the name thus given them in Scripture?

*A.* When presbyters were called bishops, the Apostles were the real overseers of the Church, and it seemed obvious that those who had higher offices in it, such as S. James, Bishop of Jerusalem, Bishops Timothy and Titus, Acts xvi. 6, and a more extensive overseership than the presbyter-episcopi just mentioned, should specially retain the title of Bishop; whereas to call them Apostles when not sent forth on missions, but settled in towns would clearly be a misnomer,

while for the inferior order as presiding over smaller spheres of duty, and exercising a more confined range of functions, no more fitting name than that already assigned, that of presbyters or elders, intimating at once their age and dignity, could be found.

As the Apostles became settled in permanent spots, cities, or districts, they took a new name from their office of overseeing them.

A similar change in the employment of the word *episcopus* is noted in classical authors.

So also *imperator* which is used for the "Commander of an army," becomes by a natural change the "sovereign," or ruler of a people. See W. T. A., note from Bentley, p. 90, 91.

Even from the beginning, the word *episcopus* was applied to the highest office in the Church, although it did not exclude the second order. W. T. A., 90, 91.

Is it not likely that presbyters are rather so called as distinguishing the priesthood, a farther and subsequent development of the Apostolate or episcopate, from the diaconate? In fact, we hear of presbyters first after the diaconate had been appointed, and as the diaconate was the first relief from serving tables &c., which the highest order felt the need of, so the need of the co-operation of an intermediate order would soon be discovered and occasion its development.

796. Q. Mention places where Apostles are mentioned.

A. 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iii. 5; iv. 11.

797. Q. Is there any mention of Apostles after "Bishop" had become the usual name?

*A.* Rev. ii. 2; xviii. 20.

798. *Q.* How do you know that these Bishops were any higher as regards their functions, than the presbyter-episcopi, of the Epistles?

*A.* Because of their powers of ordaining, &c.  
1 Tim. v. 22; Tit. i. 5; Tit. ii. 15.

These were charged by S. Paul to require and command the pastors and preachers to refrain from false doctrine, and to stop their mouths, and reject them that do otherwise, to ordain elders according to the necessity of the places, and receive accusation against them; and sharply and openly to rebuke them if they sinned, and that with all authority. These things the Apostle earnestly requireth, and before CHRIST and His elect angels chargeth Timothy and Titus to do. It is then evident they might so do; for how vain and fruitless were all these protestations made by S. Paul, if Timothy and Titus had only voices amongst the rest, and nothing to do but as the rest. *Bilson.*

S. Clement. "They gave a direction, in what manner, when they should die, other chosen and approved men should succeed in their ministry."

S. Irenæus. "We can name the men the Apostles made Bishops in their several Churches, appointing them their successors." Taken from A Catechism, &c. 16, 17.

799. *Q.* Has not S. Jerome a particular passage, supposed to favour the view of the parity of the Bishop or presbyter?

*A.* He has; but his meaning in this ambiguous passage must be explained in accordance with the general tenor of his language on the subject, which

is quite opposed to the parity of the Bishops and presbyters. *See Hooker, vii. v. 8.*

S. James, who is called the brother of the **LORD**, after our **LORD's** Passion, immediately was ordained by the Apostles Bishop of Jerusalem. *S. Jerome.*

The safety of the Church consists in the dignity of the chief priest. Hence it happens that without the authority of the Bishop, neither priest, nor deacon, have the power of baptizing. *Ibid.* For what does the Bishop do, with the exception of ordination, which the priest does not do? *Ibid.* Quoted in W. T. A.

800. Q. Is it right to ask which of the three orders did the Apostles first appoint?

A. No; because they were themselves of the first order (Bishops without restraint, Hooker,) and the development of the lower orders would properly spring from them, or be an extension of their power in some more limited portion of its exercise.

801. Q. What was the manner of their appointment?

A. By laying on of hands.

802. Q. Was this necessary to all? Might not men in whom were eminent gifts become rulers and chief pastors of churches without this ordination?

A. Even men chosen of **GOD** and already guided by the **Spirit** must notwithstanding have a special mission and the laying of hands. *Acts ix. 15; xiii. 2.*

803. *Q.* What have we said already is the derivation of the word priest?

*A.* From presbiteros, elder (Gk.), hence presbytero (Sp.), preoster (Sax.), priester (Dutch), prestre now prêtre (Fr.)

804. *Q.* As then a minister of the second order was called presbyter evidently in respect to his age and authority, are we when we use the word priest, derived from it, to attribute to the second order the sacerdotal character now commonly assigned to the word priest, or its derivative meaning?

*A.* The functions actually performed by the priest will enable us to determine how far one or both of these meanings should prevail.

805. *Q.* What then is the Scripture testimony to the separate order of priests?

*A.* Ordained: Acts xiv. 23; 1 S. Pet. v. 2.

Intercessors: S. James v. 14, 15. In council: Acts xv. 4, 6; xvi. 4. Rulers: Acts xx. 17, 28.

The Episcopi or overseers of ver. 28 are called elders in ver. 17.

806. *Q.* Mention further instances where, though presbyters, they are called Episcopi.

*A.* They are clearly a separate order from Bishops, as successors of the Apostles. Titus, Bishop of Crete, is to ordain elders in every city, Tit. i. 5; and these are afterwards named Bishops, ver. 7; but the description has clearly nothing peculiar to the episcopal office as executed by Titus, but relates to the inferior order and points out the qualifications without which he must not receive persons into it.

807. *Q.* Is the priest to be accounted the same in office as the *sacerdos* of the Latins and the *ἱερεὺς* (*hiereus*) of the Greeks?

*A.* If the presbyter performs sacerdotal acts he must be more than the mere derivation of the word indicates, he must be a proper priest, having a true sacerdotal character.

808. *Q.* What are then the proper functions of a priest?

*A.* By priest (*ἱερεὺς*), according to the Scriptures is meant either, 1. One who ministers to God in the name and on the behalf of the congregation; Heb. v. 1; viii. 3; 1 Sam. ii. 28; or 2. One who ministers to the congregation in the Name and on the behalf of God: Deut. x. 8; xxi. 5; xviii. 5, 7. *Perceval's Letter to Dr. Arnold.*

809. *Q.* And how are the functions of the ministers of CHRIST shown to correspond with this definition?

*A.* 1. They solemnly offer up the prayers of the congregation; they minister at an altar. Heb. xiii. 10, they consecrate the bread and wine to be the body and blood of CHRIST, and present it when consecrated before the throne of God as the commemorative sacrifice of the death of CHRIST, to reconcile sinners to God. 2. They solemnly celebrate and administer the Sacraments and all Sacramental rites. 3. They deliver authoritatively the will and word of God; pronounce and seal the absolution of the penitent from his sins.

810. *Q.* What is the direct Scripture testimony

to the use of sacrificial words as applied to the Christian Mysteries?

*A.* Rom. xv. 16. S. Paul declares himself a λειτουργόν leitorugon of JESUS CHRIST to the Gentiles, (*ἱερουργοῦντα hierourgounta*) ministering the Gospel that (*ἡ προσφορά he proshphora*) the offering (up), i.e. the Eucharistic offering of the Gentiles might be acceptable. So S. Paul, Heb. xiii. 10. We have an (*θυσιαστήριον*) altar whereof they have no right to eat who (*λατρεύοντες*) serve the tabernacle.

They are all included in this impudent charge of "heathenish priestcraft," and perhaps, if he durst, he would have laid it upon the Apostle, as well as by consequence, upon his fellow labourer S. Clement, for he spoke of the holy Eucharist after the same "heathenish manner" as he will have it, in sacrificial terms; for such are not only "altar," Heb. xiii. 10, both in the literal and figurative sense for an "altar offering," but the "LORD's Table" and the "LORD's Supper;" for antiquaries know, that it was the custom among the Greeks after sacrifice was ended, to make a feast and that for that purpose there were tables set up in the temples. \* \* \* It was in a parallel between the sacrificial eating of pagans in the temples of their gods, and that of the Christians in their churches, that the Apostle said, "Ye cannot drink of the cup of the LORD and the cup of devils; ye cannot be partakers of the LORD's Table and the table of devils." Here the holy Apostle is involved in the indictment of priestcraft,—for the word "Supper" or any other word for eating and drinking that relates to any god or temple is a sacrificial term. So in Julius

Pollux the heathenish banquets in honour of their gods, are called *ἱερὰ δεῖπνα*, "holy suppers," and the sacrificial feasts in honour of Hecate are called her *δόρποι*, or suppers. Hickes on *Christian Priesthood*.

811. Q. Was the language used by the early Church very decisive on this question?

A. Nothing was more plain than that they thought themselves, both Bishops and subordinate clergy, a sacerdotal order of men.

Conf. S. Chrysos. de Sacerdotio passim.

S. Hier. adv. Lucif. c. 8. "There is no Church where there are not priests (sacerdotes.)"

"And seeing there are many other grievous crimes of which Basilides and Martial are guilty, in vain do they pretend to re-enter upon their episcopal office, seeing it is evident that such men cannot preside over the Church of God, *nor ought to offer sacrifices to God.*" *Synod. Epistle of the African Bishops.* S. Cyprian.

"Who would," says S. Gregory Nazianzen, "make a defender of the Gospel, that is to stand before God with angels, and glorify Him with archangels, and whose office it is to transmit *sacrifices* upwards to the altar above, and execute the priest's office with CHRIST, who would make such an one, as they form statues of clay in a day?"

"For if he, who is chosen to make atonement for the people, needs atonement himself, what can become of such an one who doth not sustain his function?" *Greg. Nyss.*

812. Q. Have the Divines of the Church of England maintained this doctrine?

A. It is maintained by the most distinguished

Divines of the Church of England, among whom are Andrewes, Taylor, Bull, Hickes, and Waterland.

Bishop Andrewes, Serm. v. 355; Lib. Ang. Cath. T. Bishop Taylor, Holy Living, sect. x. 4. Waterland, vii. p. 349.

813. Q. Do the prophecies lead us to expect it?

A. In a most striking manner. And the historian Eusebius has commented upon Isaiah xix. 19, "In that day there shall be an altar to the **LORD**," observing, "that if the Egyptians had an altar, and that they were to sacrifice to Almighty **God**, they must be (*πάντως πον*) in every way thought worthy of a priesthood also. And that as the Levitical priesthood could not be of any use to them, therefore they must have another. And this was spoken of all nations and (then) idolatrous people, who now pour forth their prayers not unto many gods, but to the one and only **LORD**: and unto Him erect an altar for reasonable and unbloody sacrifices in every place of the whole habitable world, according to the mysteries of the New Testament. So Mal. i. 11.

814. Q. How does the Church of England show her appreciation of this doctrine?

A. In her Ordinal—in which the candidate requires to be admitted to the "order of Priesthood." And the Bishop demands "if he thinks in his heart that he is called to the ministry of the priesthood;" and the candidate answers, "he does;" which answer should be compared with Acts v. 4. In the Ordinal, this degree in the

ministry is called more than once, "Office of Priest-hood," the parties admitted thereunto "Priests." And throughout the Book of Common Prayer, the words "the Priest" are frequently used, and especially at Communion. As, "the Priest standing at the north side," &c.; "then shall the Priest rehearse distinctly all the Ten Commandments;" "then shall the Priest say to them that come to receive the Holy Communion;" "then shall the Priest turning himself to the people for the absolution;" "then shall the Priest kneeling down."

*Note.*—That generally in the Communion Office where no sacerdotal function is being exercised, Minister and "one of the Ministers" is used; elsewhere, "the Priest;" and specially, "then shall the Priest, kneeling down at the LORD's Table, say in the *name* of all those," &c. The Prayer of *Consecration* is so spoken of, which "the Priest is to say;" "and if the consecrated Bread or Wine be all spent the Priest is to consecrate more."

By "the Priest" is meant the celebrant, always spoken of as "*the* Priest"—in contradistinction to any others, whether priests or deacons, who may be present, who are spoken of as "Ministers." See this distinction curiously observed in the rubric at the end of the Communion Office, "And in cathedrals," &c. And again, "And if any of the bread and wine," &c., where the curate who might not be officiating as the presiding Priest, is distinguished from "*the* Priest."

In the First Book of Edward VI., there is this rubric, "If there be a Deacon or other Priest,

then shall he follow with the chalice, and as *the Priest*," &c.

The Priest was thus characterised in the First Prayer Book of King Edward, "The Priest that shall execute the Holy Ministry," and it is ordered that "he shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration."

In the Church the President gives the blessing, (lit. the Peace.) *S. Chrysostom*. Justin Martyr also makes mention of the President in his account of the celebration of the Eucharist.

815. Q. But if there be Christian Priests, tell me how is this consistent with S. Peter's declaration, which makes all the laity priests, "Ye are a royal priesthood," being addressed to laymen as well as the clergy?

A. The same passage makes everyone a king as well as a priest, and unless a restrained interpretation of S. Peter's and S. John's words were used, all degrees, civil as well as ecclesiastical, would be confounded; for then every one would be not only a priest, but also a king.

And S. James would not have directed presbyters to be sent for to the sick if every one was a presbyter. W. T. A. 79.

The laity are priests as being consecrated to His service. In the words of S. Augustine, Christians whether lay or clergy are priests, for they are all members of the one High Priest JESUS CHRIST, but then the special ministration of God's words and sacraments is committed to certain persons separated for the work whereunto they are called, whence arise the relative duties of clergy and laity. W. T. A. 78.

816. *Q.* What is the duty of the people towards their ministers?

*A.* To account of them as ministers of CHRIST and stewards of the mysteries of GOD; to pray for them that they may make known the mystery of the Gospel; to know them and esteem them very highly in love, for their work's sake; and to obey them as having the rule over them, and as watching for their souls. 1 Cor. iv. 1. Eph. vi. 19, 20. 1 Thess. v. 12, 13. Heb. xiii. 17.

817. *Q.* What is the account of the appointment of Deacons?

*A.* Acts vi. They were expressly appointed to assist the Apostles or first Bishops of the Church. Hence their name *Διάκονοι*, and Ministers.

818. *Q.* Explain this more particularly.

*A.* S. Peter found that it was necessary that he himself and his fellow apostles should not "leave the word of GOD and serve tables," and consequently for the purpose of attending to the temporal necessities of the flock and of the Church, was the order of deacons created.

Mosheim supposes, with great probability, that the Diaconate was already instituted, (Acts v. 6, 10,) but that the deacons here appointed (Acts vi.) were for the special assistance of the widows of the Hellenist or foreign Jews, as appears from their Greek names. *Soame's Mosheim*, i. 79, 80.

819. *Q.* There was then no spiritual character attached to their work?

*A.* So far from this being the case we find two of them, Stephen and Philip, preaching, and Philip baptizing.

Acts vi. 10; vii. 2, 12; viii. 5, 35. 1 Tim. iii. 9, 13. Deacons are styled by Ignatius, "Ministers of the Mysteries of CHRIST," who adds that they "are ministers not of meats and drinks, but of the Church of God."

820. Q. Might the deacon rise to a higher order?

*A.* We learn from the sacred text that he might by zeal and devotion "purchase to himself a good degree."

1 Tim. iii. 13; which compare with 1 S. Pet. v. 5, where "younger" is opposed to "elder," and means "deacon" as "elder" means a distinct spiritual office. See Note in Soame's Mosheim, i. 80.

821. Q. Is the ecclesiastical view of the office of a deacon conformable with this?

*A.* We find in ecclesiastical practice a marked difference in the spiritual character of the priesthood and diaconate; and that the latter, while the degrees of its spiritual obligation are lower, contains in it little of independent action which is of a spiritual nature.

That the Diaconate was regarded in a very different light from what it now is, as a mere passage to the priesthood,—that it was considered as something very distinct in the character of the vows which it implied from those of the priesthood,—as an entirely characteristic function, and

yet much lower in the degrees of its spiritual obligations, may be seen by the following passage in Walton's Life of Herbert.

"Ordained Deacon 1626. Although Prebendary of Layton Ecclesia and rebuilding its church he does not seek priest's orders till 1630, when he was presented with Bemerton; at receiving which the apprehension of the last great account that he was to make for the cure of so many souls, made him fast and pray often, and consider for not less than a month; in which time he had some resolutions both to decline the priesthood and that living. But Laud, then Bishop of London, did so convince Mr. Herbert that the refusal of it was a sin, that the canonical clothes were ordered against the next day. When he had changed *his sword and silk clothes* into a canonical coat, he returned so habited to his wife and said, 'You are now a minister's wife.' It was afterwards that the great sanctity of the short remainder of his holy life was made conspicuous." The same is observable concerning Nicholas Ferrar. His object was to render himself competent to officiate as the head of a religious society, to have a sacred position towards them, but not to undertake the priest's office. He therefore confined himself to the more limited responsibilities of deacons' orders.

By the Ordinal of the Church of England the Deacon is not allowed, without a licence from the Bishop, even to preach. If he is to baptize infants, it is in the absence of the priest. Again, he is to search for the sick, poor, and impotent people of the parish, to intimate their estates, names and places where they dwell, unto the curate, that by his exhortation they may be relieved, &c. Even the work of appealing to the sympathy of others

is accounted to be properly that of the curate. He can catechise; and read Homilies as essentially pertaining to his office. It thus appears that apart from the Priest he can ordinarily perform no administration; and that when he does minister apart from the Priest, it is only as his subordinate, and that his acts have no *sacramental* power but through the Bishop or Priest by whom he is commissioned to perform them. The Church appears, in theory at least, to ignore the services of a Deacon in all her public offices except as *an assistant*.

In extreme cases, however, when an Incumbent being a Deacon, cannot procure a Priest's services it would seem from ancient authorities, that as under similar circumstances a modification of the theory was allowed, so it might be admitted here. In cases of impending death it was allowed for a Deacon to take a confession, and to lay on hands in the Priest's absence.

A Deacon was allowed to reconcile a penitent if the appointed time had expired, and confession had been made; but Thomassin says that he could only do this "by giving the Eucharist," (observe, "not consecrating" and then giving it.) The Council of Elvira says that in a case of urgency it is necessary that the Priest should give the Communion, and the Deacon, if the Priest order it—which the Deacon could do without consecration—for it must be remembered that the consecrated elements were and are still reserved in most branches of the Church.

822. Q. But is there not much reason to fear that the distinct character of the Deacon's office is now lost sight of?

A. There is practically no use made of the Dea-

con's office as a distinct institution. It is now used merely as a passage from one stage of ecclesiastical status to another, and apparently without even the object of probation ; Deacons being sent sometimes to separate cures of souls and called upon to supply wants most properly provided for by Priests.

823. Q. Is this an adequate fulfilment of the Deacon's office ?

A. It is quite clear that the Deacon's office was not intended to be merely a passage to the higher degree, but a permanent institution necessary to the welfare of the Church,—the functions of which, if performed at all, must fall either unequally on the priesthood or devolve upon unauthorised and undisciplined laymen. The Deacon's office is essential to the completeness and integrity of the constitution of the Church. The three orders have always been esteemed necessary to the perfect working of the Church system—and the Church will doubtless not be rightly or efficiently doing its full work until the Diaconate is properly developed.

824. Q. What body do the three orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons form ?

A. The clergy from *κλῆρος*, lot.

Jerome saith : "Therefore are they called clergymen or clerks, either because they are the **LORD's** portion (to serve the Church of **CHRIST**), or for that the **LORD** is their portion and part (to live on such things as are dedicated to the **LORD**)."

825. Q. But what other portion of Christians,

by far the larger part, go to make up the full body of the Communion of the Saints ?

**A.** The Communion of Saints comprises besides the clerus also the laity from *λαός*, laos.

The word *λαός*, whence lay is derived, importeth even "the LORD's peculiar people;" which distinction of people from priest is neither profane nor strange in the scriptures. Isa. xxiv. 2; Hos. iv. 4. *Bilson.*

Orders in the Church are four, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and the Faithful. Optatus, ad Parmen. ii. 25. W. T. A. 80.

826. **Q.** Ought all Churches to have Bishops over them who are successors of the Apostles ?

**A.** Yes ; otherwise they cannot claim for themselves with any truth the title Apostolic, i.e. sent under the Apostolic Commission. *See note from Irenaeus supra.*

827. **Q.** What care is taken to preserve the Apostolic succession ?

**A.** Such care is taken in this matter that every Bishop set over the Church is consecrated by the laying on of hands of three other Bishops, each of whom have been likewise made Bishops by three others.

*Note.*—In the Apostolic Succession three Bishops have always laid their hands on every Bishop ordained, so that if one fail of a right succession, the others would not. A triple cord is not quickly broken.

1. Those who oppose the spiritual succession of Bishops are concerned to prove that it has ever

been broken. It is certain that the Bishops of the Church claim to possess it, and point to a long list of their spiritual predecessors.

2. Our Blessed Lord promised to be with His Church to the end of the world, and having once established a succession, it is improbable that He would allow it to fail.

828. Q. What is the object of this peculiar care?

A. Lest through any fault of consecration the succession should become vitiated and not continued. The probability of any three Bishops appointed to consecrate a Bishop-elect being all invalidly consecrated is so great as to render it next to an impossibility; for it implies that each of the several Bishops by whom they were themselves consecrated were invalidly consecrated. If only one of the three in any act of consecration has been validly consecrated it has sufficed to preserve the succession.

Irenæus, *Contr. Heres.* bk. 3, ch. 3. As it would be too long to record the succession of Bishops of each Church, we confound all those who by self-love, or vanity, or blindness, or error, separate themselves from the legitimate assemblies of the Church to make separate conventicles, in placing before their eyes tradition and the Apostolice Faith transmitted by a continual succession of Bishops unto our time in the greatest, the most ancient, the best known of all the Churches, founded at Rome by the glorious Apostles S. Peter and S. Paul.

Tertullian also says: "Let the heretics produce the origin of their Churches, let them make

known the order followed by their Bishop, who by a continual succession ascends to a first Bishop who has succeeded an Apostle, or to some Apostolic man who has lived with them; as the Church of Smyrna produces Polycarp, established by S. John; as the Church of Rome produces Clement, ordained by S. Peter; as all the other Churches produce Bishops, who established in the Episcopate by some Apostle have transmitted to their successors the Apostolic Law." Tert. Pres. cont. H. ch. 32.

829. *Q.* And was this succession preserved at the Reformation?

*A.* It was; for Cranmer was for a part of his Archiepiscopate a Romanist and acknowledged by the Pope; so that his orders if valid before were valid after.

830. *Q.* Do not Romanists deny that we have the Succession?

*A.* They have attempted to do so by a fictitious narrative of a consecration at the Nag's Head Inn; but even a French writer, Couraver, has disproved this; as also does Lingard, himself a Romanist.

*The Forgiveness of Sins.*

831. *Q.* What is this doctrine also called in one of the Church offices?

*A.* In the Baptismal Office, it is called "remission of sins," both in the Creed and in the Prayer, "Almighty and immortal God, the aid," &c.

832. Q. In the ancient creeds of the Church, where did this Article appear?

A. Immediately after that of "the Holy Church."

833. Q. Does this point out any designed relation between the two Articles?

A. To show that forgiveness of sins was generally to be understood of that remission, which is obtained by the ministry of the Church.

According to the intention of those who compiled the Creed, it seems principally to design that formal remission of sins, which was consigned by the Church's ministry. *Barrow*, 279.

N.B.—For the rationalistic objections to the doctrine of remission of sins as distinct from the application of it, see Questions 458 to 463 and Appendix to Creed.

834. Q. How is this relation between the articles, "remission of sins, and the Catholic Church," shown?

A. Partly by its nearness to the article of belief in the Church, and partly from the words of the Nicene Creed, "One baptism for the remission of sins," for baptism implies the Church, since the Church is the only authorised channel of its administration.

835. Q. And does the introduction of the article of the Communion of Saints in any degree affect this teaching?

A. No; more especially as it has been shown that the doctrine of the Communion of Saints, is only a development of that of the Holy Catholic Church.

836. Q. How would you sum up the main objects of the creed to show the connection of these three articles more conspicuously?

A. By treating of it in two divisions,—the first, to declare the being and offices of the FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST; the second, to illustrate their work in the foundation of the Church, for the redemption, purification, and eternal reward of its members.

837. Q. Was the foundation of the Church for the remission of sins?

A. 1. The forerunner of our SAVIOUR, S. John the Baptist went before the LORD to give knowledge of salvation by the remission of sins, (S. Luke i. 76, 77); 2. As our SAVIOUR Himself was sent by His FATHER for the taking away our sins; so He sends His Apostles, appointing remission of sins as the fundamental function of His Church. (S. John xx. 21—23.)

“When our Blessed SAVIOUR refers to His own mission from the FATHER, as the model, so to speak, of the mission of His own Apostles, no better method can be thought of to discover the meaning of the terms of that mission, than by examining into the acts of the original commission from the FATHER, which our SAVIOUR read in the synagogue, from Isa. lxi. 1, 2, &c., which speaks of binding up the brokenhearted, proclaiming liberty to the captive, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound,” &c., &c. expressions figurative of the liberty from the bondage of sin and Satan obtained through the remission of sins. *Guide to Sick Penitent.* So Isa. xlvi. 7. See also S. Luke v. 20, 23, 24, and 47, 48.

838. *Q.* And after the Church was constituted, is the same object shown to have been carried out?

*A.* After our SAVIOUR's sending the HOLY GHOST on the Apostles at the Day of Pentecost, at the first gathering in of the Church, S. Peter exhorted his hearers to enter it, by a summons to repentance and the promise of the remission of sins by CHRIST in baptism. (Acts ii. 38 ; iii. 19 ; x. 43—8 ; xiii. 38.)

839. *Q.* Was the doctrine of the remission of sins peculiar to the Gospel?

*A.* Remission of sins is the characteristic blessing of the Gospel, and was prophetically assured as the fountain which was to be opened for forgiveness in that day. (Acts xiii. 39 ; Zech. xiii. 5 ; Rom. viii. 3.)

*Note.*—The law, strictly speaking, promises life only upon perfect obedience, saying, “Do this and live.” For greater sins the punishment was death; for less and ordinary sins, sacrifices were appointed, and God appeased. Any thing further was special Divine indulgence more than promised by Moses. Moreover, whatever virtue was in sacrifices operated alone through the death of CHRIST. (Rev. xiii. 8.) All atonements that were ever made for sin, were only effectual through His Blood. *Pearson.*

There was no expiation prescribed by the law for the inward guilt of sin; but for outward uncleanness, or incapacities of conversing among the people of God, together with some sins which the law specifies, but condemns not to any bodily or pecuniary punishment. *Thorndike*, Vol. iv. Pt. 1. 190.

When S. Paul teaches us that "without shedding of blood there is no remission," he intimates that sacrifices had their virtue for great offences through the bloodshedding of CHRIST alone.

840. *Q.* Why is the Article, Remission of sins, subjoined to the Article of "the Church?"

*A.* First, because the keys with which heaven is shut and reopened, i.e., the power of binding and loosing, of retaining and remitting sins, which is placed in the ministry of GOD's Word, confided and allowed to the Church by CHRIST, properly pertains to her. 2ndly. Because no one obtains remission of sins who is not a true member of the body of CHRIST, i.e., who does not cultivate and defend the common communion of the Church, studiously, piously, and holily, and with perseverance unto the end. *Nowell's Lat. Cat.*

There is no forgiveness of sins out of the communion of the Church. *Wilson, Vol. v. 556.*

Though I have shown that remission of sins committed after baptism may be obtained without the keys of the Church, yet it is hard to find any express promise to that effect in the writings of the Apostles, unless it be that of 1 S. John i. 9, in which notwithstanding, a limitation of that confession, which the Apostle requires, to the Church and to those that are trusted by the Church may reasonably be understood. *Thorn-dike, Vol. iv. Pt. 1. 209.*

This doctrine, viz., that remission of sins is imparted through the Church, is maintained not to give power to the Church or its ministry, but to prevent the members of the Church from ascribing their salvation to themselves, to their re-

penitance, prayers, almsgivings, and general good works. It is necessary that the prevenient grace of GOD should be always carefully asserted. Remission of sins does not precede baptism or repentance, but is given in it and afterwards on sin repented, the act of the Church must and does pass; though it need not be given formally, but is valid through the interest which every member of CHRIST has in the daily remission of sins, or the part he has in the blessings of the Eucharistic Communion. Thorndike desirous of disproving the doctrine of the Church of Rome, that confession of sins to a priest is necessary in every case, does not seem sufficiently to take into account this necessary truth. IV. Pt. 1. 186, 7.

841. *Q.* Is the remission granted by GOD in baptism so entire, that all sinfulness is done away in the party receiving it?

*A.* No such doctrine was ever intended to be conveyed by the Article, "Remission of Sins in Baptism." After regeneration, the infection of nature remaineth, which is not subject to the law of GOD (Art. ix.); hence the grace of GOD in baptism is curative, not final in its action. *Collects Explained*, 98.

842. *Q.* What is the derivation of the word "remission?"

*A.* Remission is from the Latin, *mitto*, I send, and *re*, back again.

843. *Q.* What teaching is conveyed by this expression?

*A.* The sending or putting back of the sin which is against man; so that notwithstanding the infection of nature, keeping him under the

power of sin, remaineth, God's favour is no longer denied him ; but the graces of the HOLY SPIRIT, which would otherwise not flow to him, are now without impediment allowed a free course.

*Note.*—Briefly put thus in “Collects Explained,” 97, “A sending, or putting sins back, so that God's grace should have free course.”

The sentence of ministerial absolution touching sin, only declarereth us free from the guiltiness thereof, and restored unto God's favour, &c., &c. *Hooker*, vi. c. vi. 5.

844. Q. In what way or ways, then, is the “remission of sins” conferred ?

*A.* The first is by baptism ; and because this is the *great means* by which God is first reconciled to man, it is the subject of the article of the Nicene Creed, “One baptism for the remission of sins.”

845. Q. Give a definition of baptism in this connection.

*A.* Baptism is the one great forgiveness of sins once for all imparted, taking us out of the kingdom of Satan, and placing us into the kingdom of God, in a condition of acceptableness (“State of Salvation,” 1st part) before Him, and thus enabling us to carry on our life in CHRIST with energy, in the assured hope and peace of a redeemed state.

*Note.*—The Emperor Constantine (with some other early Christians) thought it an advantage that all his sins should be forgiven, just before death,

and consequently delayed baptism till then. But this was to misunderstand the object of the forgiveness of sins, to lose sight of the beneficial and curative effects of the sacrament, which are, that the Christian, having received therein the gifts and powers of the new life might, assisted and sustained by this influence, fight manfully, and with daily increasing strength, the good fight of faith. Constantine lost his opportunity of making a life-long use of the Christian gifts and graces, to be derived through baptism; and therefore did not avail himself of that very strength, which was the one great object of the sacrament.

846. *Q.* Then the primary use of the remission of sins is to replace man in the favour of GOD?

*A.* Yes; with a view to restore him to his original purity, and to carry him forward to the perfection which is in CHRIST JESUS.

847. *Q.* Is remission conferred more than once in a man's life?

*A.* Yes, by remission, 1. Of sins original and actual in baptism.

*Note.*—All sins of which any person is guilty are remitted in the baptism of the same person. (Acts ii. 38; xxii. 16; Eph. v. 26.) See also Offices for Baptism and Confirmation.

And yet it is not to be supposed that the evil effect of sin on the soul is at once done away. As respects "original sin," the infection of nature remaineth, and requires careful subjugation; and as regards "actual sins," the habit of evil in the soul is only gradually and with painstaking effort done away. But that this may be effected, GOD has 1st, pardoned sins; 2ndly, granted the continuance of the grace of His HOLY SPIRIT.

## 2. By remission of sins done after baptism.

*Note.*—All sins committed by any person after baptism, are remissible upon true repentance through the ministry of the Church. Art. XVI.; 1 S. John i. 8.

848. Q. When boys commit sins then, how, (as before Confirmation they seem to be without the same means of remission as adults have, viz., the Holy Eucharist,) do they obtain forgiveness? Is it merely by repentance?

A. No. We cannot by our own acts alone obtain remission. We have always need of the preventing grace of God; and therefore is the remission of sins which is applied morning and evening throughout the year in the daily service applicable for them as for adults. Also, as a part of the Church Militant, they have their interest in the celebration of CHRIST's death for the remission of sins in the Holy Communion.

The Holy Communion is not celebrated for the benefit of those only who partake before each particular altar of the consecrated elements, but for the whole Church,—for those who attend, and for those also who from valid reasons are hindered.

849. Q. Was the necessity for the remission of original sin ever disputed?

A. Yes, by the Pelagian and Socinian heresies, which denied the original corruption of man through Adam.

850. Q. And was the necessity for the remission of sins done after baptism, ever disputed?

**A.** Yes, by the Novatian heresy, and also by the Donatists. By Novatus, it was contended that to a person once admitted to the kingdom of CHRIST there was no re-entrance after falling away.

The first of name that openly in writing withstood the Church's power to remit sin was Tertullian. *Hooker*, vi. c. vi. 6.

*Note.*—This was an attempt to have the Church on earth pure as when redeemed and triumphant in heaven. In its efforts for purity, this party became unmerciful, and lost sight of the curative discipline, as if the work of the Church was more

• to keep herself holy, by driving out everything unholy, than to make holy by purifying everything unholy within.

They gave themselves the title of Cathari, pure and unspotted men. *Hooker*, vi. c. vi. 7.

It was on this account that Novatus was censured (Conc. Nicæn. Can. 8) viz., because he denied absolution to the lapsed. *Hammond's Power of Keys*, quoted by Wilson, p. 557.

S. Ambrose observes that the Novatians say that they show reverence to the LORD, in reserving to Him alone the power of forgiving sins. But indeed none do Him greater wrong than they who would rescind His commands, and cast back upon Himself the office He committed to them.

The Novatianists took exception at the multitude of public penitents to insult over the discipline of the Church, against which they cried out "He that showeth sinners favour, doth but teach the innocent to sin." They made sinners not the fewer, but the closer and the more obdurate. *Hooker*, vi. 4.

I call this the heresy of Novatian, rather than

of Novatus, because though they be both joined in it, yet it rather sprung from Novatianus the Roman presbyter than from Novatus the African Bishop. *Pearson, Notes on p. 621.*

Novatian by study became the very same which Tertullian had been before through a secret natural distemper, upon his conversion to the Christian faith, and recovery from sickness, which moved him to receive the sacrament of Baptism on his bed. The Bishop, contrary to the canons of the Church, would needs in special love towards him, ordain him presbyter, which favour satisfied not him who thought himself worthy of greater place and dignity. Having by fraud procured his own consecration to be a bishop, he sent letters to sundry churches advising them never to admit to the fellowship of holy mysteries such as had after baptism offered sacrifice to idols. *Hooker, vi. c. vi. 6.*

The mercies of God and the merits of CHRIST being infinite, no sin can be unpardonable, but what is incurable. *Wilson, v. 632.*

A very pregnant maxim of theology!

The Anabaptists, revivers of the Donatist error, deny the benefit of repentance to persons after baptism. *Hom. ii. xx., p. 587.*

851. *Q.* What does the term remission of sins seem to involve?

*A.* A necessity of instruments through which the sin may be remitted or sent away.

*Illustration.*—Such remission as was afforded under the law, was done through a regular instrumentality, viz., the priests.

S. John was an instrument through his baptism, for the remission of sins.

The people wondered, after CHRIST's miracle in proof that He had power to forgive sin, that GOD had given such power unto *men*.

Our SAVIOUR made His Apostles instruments to the same end, when He sent them forth to remit and retain sins.

852. Q. Does the Church of England claim for her priests this power?

A. In ordination, when the Bishop lays on them his hands, he repeats the very words of CHRIST, in giving the same power to His Apostles.

"Receive the HOLY GHOST for the office and work of a priest in the Church of GOD, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. 'Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained.'" *Ordering of Priests.*

Either there is a power corresponding with these words, bestowed on those ordained, or the use of the form would be a solemn but impious mockery.

The ministers' power to absolve is publicly taught and professed, the Church not denied to have authority either of abridging or enlarging the use and exercise of that power; upon the people no such necessity is imposed of opening their transgressions unto men, as if remission of sins otherwise were impossible. *Hooker, vi. c. vi. 15.*

853. Q. In what ways is remission given in the Church of England?

A. Besides the act of baptism, there are several other methods of absolution, or remission of sins

in the Church. The 1st, a general absolution of sinners, declared by the priest daily at the morning and evening services, corresponding with the morning and evening sacrifices under the law.

*Note.*—Absolution (Latin *ab*, from, *solve*, to loose) an acquitting or loosing from sin.

2ndly, One of more particular application in the Holy Communion.

*Explanation.*—By more particular application is meant, that whereas the person approaching the altar is presumed to have made a more special examination and preparation of himself for the holy rite, the absolution pronounced is more directly personal in its terms.

3rdly, The still more particular application of it in the private use of confession to a priest.

*Note.*—“That by the ministry of God’s Holy Word, he may receive the benefit of absolution, &c., to the quieting of his conscience,” &c.  
*First Exhortation, Communion Service.*

The gift is special, the assurance of pardon obtained thereby is likewise special, and though the pardon and grace of God is not tied to this ordinance alone, as though without it no remission of sins is to be obtained; yet, doubtless, there is a special virtue, and grace, of help to be sought for, and derived from this ordinance, and they who commit their eternal stake to their general hopes of Gospel pardon, must not calculate upon neglecting this instrument of grace, and being at the same time, so much benefited as they who use it, &c. *Guide to Infirn.* 115.

4thly, In the Visitation of the Sick, 1. The

more general, 2. The more particular application, after the sick man has been moved to confess, and has so done.

*Note.*—The absolving character of the Visitation of the Sick, authorised by the voice of Holy Scripture, as well as of the Church. “Is any sick, let him send for the elders of the Church.” S. James v. 14.

854. Q. But is not the absolution merely declarative?

A. Wheatley says, “If the penitent be duly prepared (which the priest ought to see to) he will as well *convey* as declare a pardon to the sick person.” *Wheatley, on Visitation.*

855. Q. Do you admit, then, that the absolution pronounced at morning prayer is merely declarative?

A. Here again, Wheatley says, it is apparent that this absolution is more than declarative, it is effective and judicial, insuring and conveying to the proper subjects thereof, the very absolution or remission itself. It is as much the bringing God’s pardon to the penitent, as an authorised messenger bringing pardon from the sovereign to a condemned criminal, is effectual to his present pardon. *Wheatley, on the Absolution at Morning Prayer: ap. Wilson, v. 58.*

856. Q. But is judicial forgiveness of sin possible?

A. The priest’s act is no less a judicial one than that of the civil judge.

*Explanation.*—After minute inquiry and

thoughtful consideration, the judge pronounces a sentence which, after all, may be an incorrect one; and a murderer if he escapes earthly sentence is still a murderer before God's judgment-seat. So one wrongly absolved on earth retains his sins before God, and yet the sentence is not void nor useless. Rightly or wrongly absolved, the penitent has further opportunity of seeking Divine grace, the channels of grace being laid open to him; and rightly or wrongly condemned, yet in either case good has been the result,—on the one hand the offender is taught the heinousness of his offence shutting him out for a time from the privileges of the kingdom of God; on the other, on a supposed unworthiness, the penitent though suffering unworthily, is suffering with a blessing "for well doing rather than ill doing," and moreover for the maintenance of the discipline of CHRIST's kingdom.

S. Jerome says: "Having the keys of the kingdom of heaven, they (the ministers of the Gospel) judge after a sort before the day of judgment, i.e., they forgive or retain sins while they judge and declare that they are forgiven by God or retained." *Usher, Answer to Challenge.*

We find, for the case of sins known either by voluntary confession, or by public notoriety, certain judges authorised and appointed, "Whose sins thou dost forgive," &c.

Absolution is not only declaratory, it is also judicial. Jewel's Apology for the Church of England acknowledges the priest to be a judge; for a judgment not only of discernment, but also of authority and of power is required. *F. Mason de Ministerio, v. 10.*

The ministers of the Gospel may be said to remit sins,—

1. *Dispositive*, by working fit dispositions.
2. *Declarative*, by publishing the conditions.
3. *Imputative*, by praying for.
4. *Dispensative*, by the sacraments, absolution, &c., whereby grace is exhibited and ratified by imposition of hands. *Barrow on Creed*, 600.

857. Q. In what light should the absolving prayers of the Church, as practised in her several services, be principally and practically regarded?

A. As conveying no final sentence or judgment upon the souls of men, but rather as the blessings of a remedial system, provided to place them in a present state of forgiveness with God, and to enable them to have such peace and reconciliation with Him, that they may with a comfortable and assured hope, go forward in the path of life to that great day, when the final absolution will be pronounced by One, Who is not merely clothed with the faculties of erring man, but is likewise imbued with the heart-searching omniscience of God. *Collects Explained*, 103.

What is then the force of absolution? Doth it by any operation derived from itself alter the state of the soul? Doth it really take away sin, or but *ascertain us of God's pardon*? The latter of which two is our assertion, the former theirs (the Church of Rome's). *Hooker*, vi. c. vi. 4.

Really to effect the removal or continuance of sin in the soul of any offender, is no priestly act, but a work which far exceedeth their ability. *Hooker*, vi. c. vi. 5.

The state of guiltiness before God is what is really removed; but the innate sinfulness by the slower process of gradual purification of the soul in

the constant and devout use of the blessed means of grace which procure CHRIST's indwelling with us.

"That remedy may be found by penance for brethren that have fallen away, being wounded by the devil after the laver of salvation; not as if they got pardon of sins from us, but that being by our means converted to understand their own sins, they may be constrained to make the fuller satisfaction to God."—Firmil. to S. Cyp. see S. Cyp. Ep. lxxv. as cited by *Thorndike*.

858. Q. To complain against the doctrine of forgiveness of sins through man, because God is the primal source of forgiveness, is much the same as what?

A. As if we were to deny what we see every day of our lives to be the fact, that physicians can cure the body of its various ailments, because they are really only instruments in the hands of God, and it is He "Who bringeth down to the grave, and Who bringeth up." *Collects Explained*, 103.

We acknowledge most willingly that the principal part of the priest's ministry is exercised in the matter of forgiveness of sins. *Usher, Answer to a Jesuit*.

859. Q. But does it not seem as if it would be too great a power to commit to any man's hands, that he should be commissioned arbitrarily to forgive or retain sins?

A. If the power were used in an arbitrary manner as respects forgiveness in the world to come,

it would indeed be terrible ; or if it might rightly be used arbitrarily in the present world, it would be a most fearful abuse of power.

Those priests who give hasty absolution exceed their own power. *See Wilson, v. 556.*

We must not suppose that a clergyman can arbitrarily, and of his own mere will forgive sins. *Collects Explained, 100.*

This is an impiety in which wicked priests, from motives of power or gain, have indeed indulged ; but it is clearly an instance of abuse. *Collects Explained.*

What we blame the Church of Rome for is that she sells pardons, and places her priests on God's throne. [Sacerdos est judex condemnare vel salvare. Bellarmine.] *Comber.*

No part of the system of the sale of indulgences, the commutation of sins for money, in whatever shape, can have admittance in a pure theology. The judgment does not set aside the corrupt working and effect of sin, but the guilt which keeps us from God's countenance and favour. The good is therefore in the use of the means of grace opened to us. How utterly useless and vain therefore the forgiveness granted to one who is intending still to go on in his wickedness, and makes a payment in hopes of remission.

Cranmer teaches us, that GOD though not seen is present with His ministers, and worketh by the HOLY GHOST in the administration of His Sacraments. And yet *His ministers may not do whatever they please* ; our LORD has given to them plain instructions what they are to teach and do, and when they do so, whosesoever sins they forgive on earth, their sins be forgiven in heaven. But if they should give absolution to

unrepentant sinners, they would but deceive, &c.  
*Cranmer's Catechism.*

“**GOD** will not forgive any without faith and repentance, and the ministers of **CHRIST** cannot pretend to be greater than He; they must see good signs of repentance and faith, otherwise they have no commission to grant absolution, nor will the sick man have any benefit if they do.”  
*Comber.*

860. *Q.* Then the priest can only forgive sins with confirmation of the sentence by **GOD** when his sentence is after the mind of **GOD**?

*A.* As respects its effect in the next world, the sentence to be confirmed must be after the mind of **GOD**; but the sentence is as well pronounced with relation to the party's position in the Church of **GOD** as militant here on earth; and he is to consider that the Church or priest, even when erring, is **GOD**'s minister.

Though the denial of spiritual privileges is a great loss, yet doubtless **GOD**'s secret aid will be given to make up the shortcomings of one unjustly or erroneously retained in sin.

861. *Q.* But is it not the province of **GOD** alone to forgive sins?

*A.* We do not claim for man any power which is the attribute of **GOD** alone. With **HIM** alone is the original fount of remission. Whatsoever power is ever used in His Church, is delegated from **HIM**. By the Church the power exercised is ministerial; with **GOD** it is sovereign, absolute.  
*Guide to Infirm, &c.*

It may be soundly affirmed that God alone doth remit and retain sins, although He have given the Church power to do both; but He one way, and the Church another. He only by Himself forgiveth sin, Who cleanseth the soul from inward blemish, and looseth the debt of eternal death. So great a privilege He hath not given unto His priests, who notwithstanding are authorized to loose and bind, that is to say, to declare who are bound and who are loosed. For albeit a man be already cleared before God, yet he is not in the face of the Church so taken, but by virtue of the priest's sentence, who likewise may be said to bind by imposing satisfactions, and to loose by admitting to the Holy Communion. Master of Sentences. *Hooker, vi. c. vi. 8.*

The act of sin God alone remitteth, in that His purpose is *never to call it to account*; the stain He washeth out by the sanctifying grace of His Spirit; and concerning the punishment of sin, as none else hath power to cast body and soul into hell-fire, so none hath power to deliver either besides Him. *Ibid.* (S. Luke xii. 5; S. Matt. x. 28.)

“How great soever the power be, which our LORD committed to His Apostles and their successors, it is but ministerial; they act only under Him as His ministers and stewards. Yea, whatsoever power they have of this nature, it is still His power in their hands; they derive it continually from Him, Who is always present with them. And, therefore, as they themselves need to have a care how they exert this power or neglect the exerting of it, so others had need take care, too, that they neither resist nor despise it.” *Beveridge.*

*Note.—It is certainly true, none could forgive*

sins but GOD only (S. Mark ii. 7.) And yet those are not vain words, "Whose sins," &c. (S. John xx. 23.)

These Scriptures are easily reconciled by another instance—the leper under the law—(Lev. xiii. 6) was healed by GOD only, the priest alone could pronounce him clean, he had certain rules given him by which he was to go; if he neglected these he acted presumptuously; if he followed them he had authority to pronounce him clean, and as such he was received into the congregation, a type of heaven. Apply this to the ministry of absolution. We are to inquire diligently into the motives, steps, signs, fruits of repentance. If we find them to be such as the Gospel requires, we declare them pardoned. If not, we pronounce them unclean, and not fit for the kingdom of heaven. *Wilson*, v. 540.

862. Q. Is there not some reason for wonder that angels, "those ministering spirits sent forth to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation," were not made ministers of this high grace?

A. We find, so far from this being the case, that though an angel was sent to Cornelius, yet it was not to remit sins, but to send to Joppa for one Simon, the proper and appointed minister of reconciliation between GOD and man.

*Note.*—The ministry and word of reconciliation committed unto them. (2 Cor. v. 18, 19.)

863. Q. Why should this mystery in the economy of grace be requisite, that man should be the appointed minister of reconciliation?

A. That flesh which offended at the first must

offer reconciliation, and by means and virtue of that union, which in CHRIST JESUS has been effected between the Godhead and His Manhood, the Son of Man has obtained power to forgive sins upon earth.

*Note.—2 Cor. v. 18, 19. GOD hath received us to Himself, by JESUS CHRIST. GOD was in CHRIST reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses to them.*

864. *Q.* Explain this more fully.

*A.* He, Who with the FATHER from everlasting, could forgive sins by His own inherent power, now by reason of His having been partaker of man's bodily substance, has obtained as Son of Man, power to exercise a delegated ministry for the remission of sins, in His kingdom and Church on earth.

865. *Q.* But does it extend to His brethren in the flesh?

*A.* Although this commission was originally granted to Him alone; yet, because "having taken the nature of man upon Him, He would honour the nature He had so taken," He associates with Himself in the same commission those sent by Him to the work of the ministry, "making them fellow workers with Himself. *Stretton's Guide to the Infirm, Sick, and Dying.*

866. *Q.* If the Word of God be so plain, as we have seen upon this subject, what should be our great concern?

*A.* Not to neglect a Divine gift because it may be abused, but to find out in what manner this

gift is to be beneficially exercised, lest we limit the grace of God. *Collects Explained*, 105.

*Note*.—We are to take care that the channels of grace should be denied to none who come seeking them with penitent hearts. *Collects Explained*, 102.

867. *Q.* What two things are necessary to remission of sins?

*A.* Grace as the only cause which takes away sin, and repentance as a duty or condition required in us.

The Fathers were slow and always fearful to absolve any before very manifest tokens given of a true penitent and contrite spirit. It was not their custom to remit sin first, and then to impose works of satisfaction, as the fashion of Rome is now. *Hooker*, vi. c. vi. 7.

868. *Q.* Is confession to the priest necessary in every instance?

*A.* Hooker says, “We everywhere find the use of confession, especially public, allowed of and commended by the Fathers; but that *rigorous* necessity of auricular and private confession, which is at this day so mightily upheld by the Church of Rome we find not.” *Hooker*, vi. c. iv. 13.

See *Exhort. to Holy Communion, First Book of Edward VI.* “Requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession not to be offended with them that do use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the Priest,” &c., &c.

Frequent mention is made in the Fathers' writings of penitency exercised within the chambers of our own hearts, and seen of God, and not communicated to any other, the whole charge of which penitency is imposed of God, and doth rest upon the sinner himself. *Hooker*, vi. c. iv. 13.

"There is great use of holy confession ; which though it be not generally in all cases and peremptorily commanded, as if without it salvation could not possibly be had ; yet," &c. *Golden Grove*. See also *Hooker*, Bk. vi. c. 4, § 15.

You must admit that confession of some sort is recognised in Scripture. I do not mean confession to God—that nobody doubts—but confession to man. The words of S. James are distinct and clear; we are to confess *one to another*. Be the question therefore what it may, it is not a question of doctrine. It is found in Scripture, and may be proved thereby. As a question of discipline, it may be good and salutary for a man to confess himself to some discreet and learned minister of God's word, or it may be good and salutary to confess himself to someone else: that may be ruled by the authority of man. But the Scriptural command is clear—he is to confess himself to somebody. *Newland's Letter to Hatchard on Confession and Absolution*.

The Homilies rejected the sacrament of confession only in the same sense as the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper [are sacraments] saying, "Absolution is no such sacrament as Baptism and the Communion are, but in a general acceptation the name of Sacrament may be attributed to anything whereby a holy thing is signified." Hom. on Common Prayer, Pt. i. Therefore the Homilies describe Confession a holy thing. *Newland's Letter to Hatchard*.

869. Q. What are the advantages to be expected from private confession?

A. When a minister knows our needs he can administer remedies; to our greater advantage commend our case in prayer to God; determine our difficulties and judge better for us than we can for ourselves: the shame of confessing sins will help to hinder us from contracting them. We shall be the better assisted in the regulation of our life, and at death the priest being no stranger to the state of the soul, will be the more prepared to guide and conduct it through all difficulties and perils.

The Church of God hath in all ages commanded, and in most ages enjoined, that we confess our sins and discover the state and condition of our souls, to such a person whom we or our superiors judge fit to help us in such need. For so, if we confess our sins to another as S. James advises, we shall obtain the prayers of the holy man whom God and the Church hath appointed solemnly to pray for us; and when he knows our needs he can best minister comfort or reproof, oil or caustics; he can more opportunely recommend your particular state to God, he can determine your cases of conscience, and judge better for you than you do for yourself; and the shame of opening such ulcers may restrain your frowardness to contract them. *Bishop Taylor, Holy Living*, c. iv. § 9. See also, "But concerning confession in private," &c. *Hooker*, bk. vi. ch. iv. 14.

It is much to be feared that our people are wounded oftener than they complain, and yet through aversion of disclosing their sore, suffer it

to gangrene, for want of their help who should work the cure. *Wheatley*, xi. sec. 4.

No kind of confession, either public or private, is disallowed by us, that is any way requisite for the due execution of that ancient *power of the keys* which CHRIST bestowed upon His Church. *Usher, Answer to a Jesuit.*

And to tell truth, if the pride and self-conceit of some, the follies of men and artifices of Satan, had not put this practice quite out of fashion among us, there is no doubt but that *more good* might be done by ministers *this way* than is now done by any other means separated from the use of this. *Hammond, Of the Power of the Keys*, ch. iv. § 103.

*Example.*—“About one day before his (Richard Hooker’s) death, Dr. Saravia, who knew the very secrets of his soul, (for they were supposed to be confessors to each other,) came to him, and, after a conference of the benefit, the necessity, the safety of the Church’s absolution, it was resolved the Doctor should give him both that and the Sacrament the day following. To which end the Doctor came, and after a short retirement and privacy, they two returned to the company; and then the Doctor gave him and some of those friends which were with him the blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our JESUS. Which being performed, the Doctor thought he saw a reverend gaiety and joy in his face.” *Walton’s Lives.* S.P.C.K.

See Guide to Infirm, Sick, and Dying, 95—106, in which this subject is treated at length.

I do not say, but that, if any do find themselves troubled in conscience, they may repair to their learned curate, or pastor, or to some other godly learned man, and show the trouble and doubt of

their conscience to them, that they may receive at their hands the comfortable salve of God's Word ; but it is against the true Christian liberty that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins. Hom. ii. xx. 592.

With respect to the confession of sinners, [our churches] teach that *private* absolution is to be retained in the Church, although, in confession, the enumeration of sins may not be necessary ; for the enumeration of all sins is impossible, according to the passage, Who can number up his secret faults ? Confession of Augsburg, Art. xii.

And because it is requisite, &c. [See First Exhortation, Communion Service, ad finem.]

870. Q. What does the Church of Rome teach concerning the necessity and frequency of confessing ?

A. By the law of confessing once a year all sins that come to remembrance, the Church of Rome seems to teach that no sin, or at least none of those which a man is bound to confess can be remitted unless the keys of the Church pass upon them. *Thorndike*, iv. p. 11. 184, 5.

Not voluntary but compulsory confession is the great point objected to by us in the Church of Rome as in Hom. ii. xx. 480, 481, where Nectarius is said to have put down "auricular confession," meaning the public use of open penance on private confession, and it is affirmed that no man should be *bound* to the numbering of his sins, though he may show the doubt of his conscience to a curate or pastor. 481.

Some particular Divines out of too forward a zeal against the Church of Rome have bended the staff a contrary way ; and instead of taking

away that intolerable burden of a sacramental, necessary, universal confession, have seemed to void and frustrate all use and exercises of the keys. *Chillingworth's Works*, vol. iii. p. 186.

That which the Church of England, ay and the Church of CHRIST does forbid, that which the Scriptures do not warrant, that which an English Bishop is not only authorised in interfering with but bound to put a stop to, is compulsory confession. It is in this point, not in the power of receiving voluntary confessions of any kind, or of any frequency, that the Church of England differs from the Church of Rome. *Newland's Letter to Hatchard*.

Bishop Hall says: "But to set men upon the rack, to strain their souls up to a double pin of absolute necessity by GOD's law, is so mere a Roman novelty, that many ingenuous authors of their own have willingly confessed it."

871. Q. What was the officer called a Penitentiary in the early Church?

A. The origin of the appointment of penitentiaries was this. It seemed burthensome that men, whose crimes were unknown, should blaze their own faults as it were on a stage. And therefore they laid the charge upon one only priest, a silent and discreet man, who according to the quality of every one's transgressions, appointed what they should do or suffer, and left them to execute it upon themselves. *Hooker*, vi. c. iv. 11.

A canon which continued in force for some hundred years, till Nectarius abolished even that confession which the penitentiary took in private. Eudæmon, a priest, considering that the incon-

venience was especially grievous by means of so manifold offensive detections, resolved easily the mind of Nectarius, that the penitentaries' office must be taken away, and for participation in God's mysteries, every man be left to his own conscience. *Hooker*, vi. c. iv. 9.

The penitentiary's office was appointed for the direction and comfort of such as should resort to him, in order to unburden their consciences of their secret sins, for assigning to men their measures of public penance, or else for assuring them that they did not need it; in short, for counselling the publication of the sins so confided to him, in the face of the Church (as was usual in the case of notorious crimes), or else for directing the concealment of them within the bosoms of the parties who had been guilty of them. *Marshall's Penitential Discipline*, 42.

They who had this public penance assigned them for sins committed in private did not always make a public declaration of the fact for which they appeared in the rank of penitents. *Ibid.* 44.

When by the imprudent direction of one of those penitentiaries, a sin was publicly confessed which had been better concealed, the inconvenience which ensued upon the discovery was the cause why Nectarius, who was then Bishop of Constantinople, abolished the whole office. The consequence of which must needs have been, that such as at that time had none but secret sins, none which gave public scandal to account for, were left entirely to the guidance of their own judgments, whether they would resort to, or abstain from, the Holy Communion. . . . yet they were still, I presume, at liberty to use the advice of a ghostly counsellor;—only there was thenceforwards no peculiar officer. *Ibid.* 43.

If it be asked whether there is any reason to think that the appointment of public penitentiaries to receive confessions was the first instance in which the Church gave its authority for the practice of private confession, it may be answered decidedly in the negative.

Socrates tells us that the addition of this officer to the ecclesiastical roll was not made till after the Decian Persecution. Sozomen, that "the bishops from the very beginning agreed to appoint him:" but we find Origen, who lived in the second century as well as in the third, speaks of confession as the received usage in his time; he does not labour the proof of it, as of a thing disputed, but mentions it as a general and well known practice, and only advises the choice of a fit person to be intrusted with it. In his time it should therefore seem, that the penitentiary was not yet appointed, because upon the institution of that officer, the liberty of choosing every man his own confessor was determined and restrained to the person whom authority had fixed upon.

872. Q. How have the Socinians and others attempted to explain away the power of remitting sins?

A. As the power of preaching the Gospel. *Pearson. Thorndike*, iv. pt. i. 185.

873. Q. How may they be answered?

A. That supposing it were true, it would be no explanation of the corresponding power of retaining sins bestowed in the same commission on the priesthood.

874. Q. The power of retaining sins seems to be even a greater gift than that of remitting them.

Are not both these powers embraced under one name?

*A.* The power of the keys, i.e., of excommunication and absolution. Also Church discipline.

*Note.*—The right use of ecclesiastical discipline is said to be one of the marks of the true Church. *Homily for Whitsunday*, Part ii. *Heathcote*, 145.

CHRIST ordained the authority of the keys to excommunicate notorious sinners, and to absolve them which are truly penitent. *Hom. II. xvi.* p. 509.

875. *Q.* Then do we not now commence the consideration of the power of the Church in a further aspect?

*A.* Yes; thus far absolution has been considered mainly as exercised over voluntary penitents; but excommunication is employed for the amendment of those who require ecclesiastical censure.

The power which our SAVIOUR gave His Church is of two kinds, the one to be exercised over voluntary penitents only, the other over such as are to be brought to amendment by ecclesiastical censure. *Hooker, vi. c. vi. 5.*

But as for notorious offences which bred open scandal, private confession was not thought sufficient: but there was further required public acknowledgment of the fault, and the solemn use of the keys for the reconciliation of the penitent. *Ussher, Answer to a Jesuit.*

876. *Q.* Were not temporal punishments introduced into Church discipline?

*A.* In the first ages of Christianity, the Church had no power but to admonish the unruly, to

keep notorious offenders from the LORD's Supper, and to turn such out of the Church as would not be reformed by these means; and even these were punishments which they found worse than death; but when kings and princes became Christians, and knew that they were answerable to God for the lives and manners of their subjects, they began to ease themselves of that burthen by putting it into the hands of the Church to punish offenders, with fines and imprisonments. *Wilson.*

877. Q. What unhappy effect did this have?

A. That people were more afraid of temporal punishments, than of excommunication, which is the most terrible judgment that can befall any Christian man. *Wilson, v. 523.*

878. Q. Ought we to take care to discriminate between the exercise of ecclesiastical and civil power in these matters?

A. However the Church be in some respects incorporated with the commonwealth in a Christian state, yet its fundamental rights remain distinct from it. Of which this is one of the chief, to receive into and exclude out of the Church, such persons who according to the laws of the Christian society, are fit to be taken in or shut out. *Stillingfleet.*

And when temporal laws interpose, it is temporal punishment only which they design to inflict or set aside. *Wilson, v. 169.*

879. Q. What is meant to be implied under the term keys?

A. They are an emblem of spiritual power, as keys open or shut passages of one place to an-

other, and consequently give entrance and keep within, or exclude from a place ; the power of the keys must, therefore, as respects the kingdom of heaven, be one of admission into, or retention within, or exclusion from it. *Barrow.*

880. Q. Show uses of the word in the Scriptures.

A. Rev. iii. 7. "He hath the key of David ; He openeth and no man shutteth, He shutteth and no man openeth." (So S. Luke xi. 52 ; S. Matt. xxiii. 13.)

They that have the keys of the kingdom of heaven are hereby signified to be stewards of the house of God, under Whom they guide, command, and judge His family. The souls of men are God's treasure committed to the trust and fidelity of such as must render a strict account for the very least which is under their custody. *Hooker, vi. c. iv. 1.*

881. Q. Show what are the uses of the words "kingdom of heaven" in Scripture.

A. First, the Visible Church, the state or constitution of religion under the Gospel, in opposition to the state of things under the ancient law. *See Questions 114—123.*

This state is called the kingdom of heaven ; of God, of CHRIST : that which was coming or approaching in the time of our SAVIOUR's humble sojourning upon earth, is now present, He reigning in heaven, into which they are said to be translated, to be made fellow-citizens and co-heirs with the saints in light, to have their conversation in heaven, to be seated together with

CHRIST in heavenly places (1 Cor. xii. 13; Eph. ii. 19; Phil. iii. 20; Heb. iii. 1; xii. 22.) The persons so related, i.e., the Church of CHRIST, may be called the kingdom of heaven.

2ndly, the phrase is sometimes taken for the perfection of this state, that everlasting kingdom of our LORD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST (2 S. Pet. i. 11) that kingdom into which not every one that saith, LORD, LORD, shall enter. (S. Matt. vii. 27.)

882. Q. From what is the authority of the keys of the kingdom of heaven taken?

A. From the words of our SAVIOUR, wherein He promises S. Peter that He would give him the keys of the kingdom of heaven (S. Matt. xvi. 19), and through him the rest of the Apostles and the whole Church (S. Matt. xviii. 17, 18; S. John xx. 23.)

Although all were interrogated, only S. Peter answered, "Thou art CHRIST, the SON of the Living GOD," so to him it was said, "I will give to thee the keys," as though he alone were to receive the power of binding and loosing; since this also he, one for all, said; and this together with all he received, as though bearing the person, of unity itself; therefore one for all, because unity is in all. *S. Aug. in Joannis Evang. Tract. cxviii.*

Upon one He builds His Church, and although He appoints to all the Apostles an equal power, yet that He might manifest unity He displays by His own authority, the origin of the same unity beginning from one. That which was S. Peter was especially also the rest of the Apostles, endowed with a like companionship both of honour

and power, but the beginning springs from unity, that the Church may be exhibited as one. *S. Cyp. de Un. Ecc.*, p. 106. See *W. T. A.* 120, 1.

All we priests have received those keys of the kingdom of heaven in S. Peter. *Ambros. Ep.* 83.

The primitive writers declare with one voice that the keys were given to the Church in the person of S. Peter. In the words of S. Ambrose, "What is said to S. Peter, is said to the Apostles." S. Cyprian, and Origen, S. Jerome, and S. Basil, are of one mind on this point. So S. Augustine in a multitude of places. S. Cyprian, indeed, in his treatise on the unity of the Church, applies the disputed texts to S. Peter; but then he speaks of him as the type of unity, the representation of a great principle, and to guard his meaning from perversion, he states in the plainest terms, that the rest of the Apostles were what S. Peter was, and had equal power and authority.

*Dr. Hook, Church Dictionary.*

Dupin, a Roman Catholic writer, affirms that the Fathers are unanimous in assigning ecclesiastical power, either to the Church generally, or to the Apostles, and after them to Bishops; that there is not one to be found, who holds it to have been given to S. Peter and his successors alone; and that they guarded against any wrong inference which might be drawn from the promise given to S. Peter, by showing that he was regarded as the representative of the Church.

Dupin furnishes authorities, not only from the early fathers, but from popes, great Bishops of the Roman Church, scholastic writers, and universities. *Dr. Hook, Church Dictionary.*

883. *Q.* Was the Apostolic practice agreeable with what has been thus far explained?

*A.* The Apostles first qualified men to enter, and then by baptism actually admitted them, (Acts ii. 38; iii. 9; Col. ii. 12, 13,) and when any were fallen from their state, overborne by temptation, or seduced by false teachers, they were ready on their repentance to restore them. (Gal. vi. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15; 2 Cor. ii. 7, 8, 10.) They rejected such as were not worthy, withdrawing the means of instruction and persuasion; (S. Luke ix. 62; Acts xiii. 46, 51; xviii. 6;) and among those admitted, exercised authority upon evil liver, the breathers of false doctrine, and those who created scandals and divisions. (Rom. xvi. 17, &c.; 2 Thess. ii. 2; 1 Cor. v. 7; ii. 10.)

884. Q. And did the governors of the early Church the same?

*A.* They opened and shut the Church; opening it by baptism, which they call (*κλεις οὐρανῶν*, SS. Basil and Naz.) the key of heaven, opening it again on repentance to persons put out, and shutting it upon persons unfit to enter. Note Tertull. Apol. cap. 38, from *Barrow*, 291.

885. Q. As you say there are two states of the kingdom of heaven, I wish to learn from you, whether the power which shuts out from the one shuts out also from the other?

*A.* These two states are inseparably coherent; that, as a step or way to this; this, a completion and consummation of that; therefore, what immediately concerns one must respect the other; and a power to admit into or exclude from the state of grace, may be said, in a manner, to be a power of open-

ing and shutting the state of glory hereafter.  
*Barrow.*

See also Questions 857, 859, 893. It is in the highest degree a presumption of future judgment shall any one so have sinned as to be banished from the communion of prayer and of assembling together, and every sacred privilege.

*Tertul.*

Though one's being in the Church does not infallibly secure his salvation, yet when a person is justly turned out of the Church, and obstinately continues so, he is in the sure way of perdition.

*Wilson*, v. 606. See also v. 483.

*Note*.—Since the persons to whom this power is imparted, exercise it here, binding and loosing upon earth, since the immediate effects thereof are here below, therefore, it seems fit that we understand the kingdom of heaven in our case, more directly of the state of grace into which Christians are here received. Though more remotely and by consequence it may imply the state of glory hereafter. *Barrow*, 284.

The same is to be said of those who are excommunicated and cast out of the Church without cause. For as no man ever doubted that to be a case which comes to pass, so can no Christianity allow that a man should be excluded the kingdom of God for another's fault. He therefore that hath the knowledge in Christianity, and the resolution for it, to keep himself to the duty of a Christian in such a case (though being destitute of all advantage by the communion of the Church, it is difficult to do); he, I say, shall obtain pardon of sin without the help of the Church, and not by desiring the ministry thereof otherwise than as not desiring communion with the

Church remains a bar to the work of God's grace. *Thorndike, Laws of the Church*, bk. iii. c. x. § 33.

It is resolved by casuists of very good note, that a penitent is bound in conscience to impose upon himself further penance than that which his confessor enjoineth; in case he be satisfied in conscience, that he hath not imposed that which is sufficient. For in the case of *clave errante*, it is manifest that there is no remission by the keys. *Thorndike, Laws of the Church*, iii. c. x. § 39.

886. Q. Explain the meaning of binding and loosing.

*A.* He that on good authority enjoins or prohibits anything, binds that thing, and makes it good or bad, lawful or unlawful, and on the other hand, he that permits the same thing to be done, or that dispenses with its doing, is said to loose. *Barrow.*

Binding and loosing belong peculiarly to the censures of the Church. *Hammond ap. Wilson*, v. 557.

The power of the keys must likewise refer to the authority of spiritual rulers to "bind" their people by some ordinances, and to loose them from others (not ordained by CHRIST Himself.) When the Bishops of a Church bind their people by an ordinance, their act is ratified in heaven; and they who seek grace through that ordinance receive it. Whereas if they loose us from an ordinance, as from many ordinances we were loosed at the Reformation, this act again is ratified in heaven, and to observe that ordinance becomes superstition, not religion. *Dr. Hook's Church Dictionary, on Power of Keys.*

887. Q. But explain the words "binding and loosing" as applied to sinners in the words, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth," &c.

A. Binding implies detaining in any present condition (as suppose a condition of guilt, of disfavour, of obnoxiousness to wrath and punishment,) either positively, by keeping on the shackles which hold any one, or negatively, by withdrawing the means of getting out.

In addition to the Apostolic practice observe our **LORD**'s enjoined discipline in the following from Marshall.

"That the Church had some power of this kind to take cognizance of her members' offences, we may learn from our **SAVIOUR**'s direction in the case of a brother trespassing against another. S. Matt. xviii. 18. First, there was to be a private admonition; if that would not do, it was to be repeated in the presence of one or two witnesses. If this method proved unsuccessful, the Church he belonged to was to be interested in the matter; he was to be solemnly convened and rebuked in public. But if nothing of all this would be available, then as the last remedy, he was to be expelled from it; to be as a heathen man and a publican. And whatsoever should thus be done upon earth, in virtue of our **SAVIOUR**'s commission (for it was not to the mixed multitude, but to His own immediate disciples, that our **LORD** upon this occasion spoke,) had a promise from Him of being ratified in heaven. S. Matt. xviii. 1. 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.' And S. Matt. xvi.

19. The authority He had before given to S. Peter upon a particular occasion He here confirmed to His other disciples.

"The Jews were enough acquainted with the terms of binding and loosing, of being to them as a heathen man and a publican, to understand the full import of them without further explanation as having a clear and wellknown reference to the current practice of Excommunication."

888. *Q.* What is the name given to the act of binding or retaining?

*A.* Excommunication, putting—*ex*, out of, *communio*, a Society.

889. *Q.* What is excommunication?

*A.* The separation from a Society; with consequent loss of its privileges. In the Christian Church it means exclusion from the body of the faithful until absolution is obtained.

*Note.*—In the case of a sincere repentance (if the sin was open and scandalous) the sinner is bound before God, until by submitting to penance, he obtain absolution from the Church. *Hammond, Power of Keys. Wilson, v. 557.*

But (you say) people now-a-days will not esteem it a punishment to be debarred from coming to the Church and Sacrament? How do you know that? He is the same God, now as heretofore, Who made men feel and fear and tremble under the censures of the Church. Let us do our duty and leave events to Him; and let us conclude, as we ought, that a person who despiseth the wholesome orders of the Church, is neither an honour nor a blessing to any Church. *Wilson, v. 524.*

And they that were so justly, exempted and banished, as it were, from the house of the LORD,

were taken (as they be indeed) for men divided and separated from CHRIST's Church, and in a most dangerous estate; yea, as S. Paul saith, even "given unto Satan the Devil for a time," (1 Cor. v.) and their company was shunned and avoided of all godly men and women, until such time as they by repentance and public penance were reconciled. Such was the honour of the LORD's house in men's hearts and outward reverence also at that time, and so horrible a thing was it to be shut out of the Church and house of the LORD in those days when religion was most pure. *Hom. II. i. p. 183.*

Absolution is *absolutely* necessary only to those who have been bound by excommunication—all other absolution being (though it may be allowed very useful and profitable for the comfort and satisfaction of the penitent) not prescribed by the text, "Whatsoever ye shall bind," &c. *Hammond, Power of Keys*, cited by *Wilson*, v. 557.

890. Q. In what way is excommunication divided?

A. Minor and major excommunication.

891. Q. What is minor?

A. When the priest with permission of the Bishop, refuses the Holy Communion to any person living scandalously. *See Rubric, at commencement of Order for Holy Communion.*

892. Q. What is major excommunication?

A. When by public sentence a Christian brother is cut off from all the privileges of Church Communion. (1 Cor. v. 3, 5, 13; 2 Cor. vii. 9—12.)

But all this (after naming the absolving powers of the priest) does not amount to the power of

excommunication, which is reserved to the bishop. *Hammond*, cited by *Wilson*.

“And such as be unquiet, disobedient, and eriminous within your diocese, correct and punish according to such authority as you have by God’s Word, and as to you shall be committed by the ordinance of this realm,” and the prayer is that the Bishop may “use the authority given him, not to destruction but to salvation, &c., that he be so merciful as not to be remiss; so minister the discipline as not to forget mercy.” *Ordinal of Church of England*.

The Bishop has here a double authority attributed to him,—one inalienable and which he has by God’s Word—the other committed to him by the “ordinance of the realm.”

“Whatever fetters may have been cast upon the ordinances of God by the constitutions of man, the Bishop should however be true to his own character, and should claim and exercise the powers appertaining to it. All antiquity points him out for the person entrusted with this discipline: S. Ignatius makes him all in all, in every matter of an ecclesiastical nature; and Ambrose excludes all from having any pretence to it, but him and such as should act by his delegation.

“If human powers will lend him their aid, and will act in concert with him, the Church of CHRIST will be truly thankful for the countenance and succour it shall thence receive; but we should at the same time be careful that the human do not extinguish the Divine ordinance, nor under pretence of helping it, in one case, hinder it in another. It subsisted for three hundred years, without any other support than what it received from the power of God and from the piety of His servants, under all discouragements. So it

might better again subsist, than depend upon support, which, instead of strengthening, shall undermine and weaken it."—*Marshall*, 99, 100.

Since the time of Gregory IX., there have been two kinds of excommunication in the Roman Church—the greater and the less. The former excludes the person from all communion with the faithful, and from the privilege of Christian burial. Subjects were absolved from allegiance to their sovereign, who lay under the greater excommunication, nay were forbidden to obey him. But in more modern times, many Catholic ecclesiastical writers have maintained that, as an excommunicated private person is not prohibited by civil governments from managing his worldly affairs, so the excommunication of a prince ought not to have any influence on matters of political administration. Besides, the spirit of the age is such as not to allow an excommunication to have the same influence on the relations between princes and people as in the middle ages. Then all religious services ceased; there was no regular burial, no ringing of the bells, &c. Gregory V. first pronounced such an excommunication against France in 998, because King Robert would not separate himself from his lawful wife Bertha, who was related to him in the fourth degree. Robert was at last obliged to yield. The excommunication of John by Innocent III. is better known. The latest excommunication of a sovereign was that of Napoleon by Pius VII. in 1809. The lesser excommunication has two effects, viz. exclusion from the Sacraments and from ecclesiastical offices.—Abridged from *Popular Encyclopædia*.

Excommunication cannot be said to have been abolished by the Reformation. Luther says, for

instance, that a person not receiving the LORD's Supper during a whole year, should be separated from the faithful. In the Church of England both the less and the greater excommunication exist. The less excludes the party from participation in the Sacraments, the greater from the company of all Christians. The sentence is attended also with the loss of many civil rights. *Ibid.*

893. Q. If any person were to die under a sentence of excommunication, what would be the effect if discipline were fully followed out?

A. By a Rubric at the beginning of the Burial Service, the office of the Church would not be used over him.

We should always bear in mind that such a regulation is made for the example of the living; not for the punishment of the dead; not as pronouncing finally upon the eternal state of the brother departed, but to warn the living with respect to persons so dying, that as their situation is one of separation from the Church on earth, so *may* it be found one of isolation from the Church redeemed in Heaven. See Note of *Barrow*, 885.

894. Q. Do not many by their habitual disregard of the most solemn office of religious worship in effect bring upon themselves excommunication?

A. When there are many to support and keep in countenance the wilful neglecter of holy communion it is impossible that the temporal effects, viz. separation from the society of the faithful, should be experienced; but the non-participant in the graces of Holy Communion does not the less

separate himself as respects all spiritual ends and purposes of grace from the kingdom of heaven —by his own act—both from the Church which is militant here on earth and that in heaven.

The Church of England deems it necessary to communion that every parishioner should communicate at least three times in the year, of which Easter to be one.—*Rubric at end of Order for Communion.*

There are people who are in the same sad case with those that stand excommunicate, though no sentence has passed upon them; viz. such as live in a contempt of the public worship of God. They cannot properly be turned out of the Church who never come into it; but they keep themselves out of the Ark, and consequently must perish.

The plea of unfitness, however it might in a few churches be made use of, yet was not generally allowed, but, much otherwise, would have awarded the party to a state of penance. *Marshall*, 164.

The Apostolical Canons endeavoured to guard against it, and annexed the penalty of segregation to such a disorderly practice. *Can. Apost. vii. Marshall*, 164.

From the deacons making the usual proclamation, “all you depart who are in a state of penance,” it might reasonably be concluded that all were in a state of penance who did not communicate. *Chrys. cited by Marshall*, 165.

In the very beginning of the fifth century we find, by the provisions made against it, that this abuse was very far extended; and accordingly the first Council of Toledo “directed the persons who were found thus tardy to submit to penance.”

So by the second Council of Lucca, "whoever should enter the Church and turn his back upon the Holy Communion should be expelled from the Church." *Marshall*, 166.

895. Q. Does there appear to be anything unreasonable in the exercise of judicial and authoritative acts in spiritual matters?

A. The necessities of one society are like those of another in this respect: and as we see men in civil societies admitted into or debarred from enjoying immunities, by persons empowered to these purposes, so must it be in spiritual bodies. Just as GOD has appointed kings and governors for the rule of nations, so CHRIST, the Head and Supreme Governor of the Church, has appointed an order of men, by whom the power of the keys is to be exercised for the benefit of the Christian brethren. *See Bishop Wilson*, v. 540. Also *Hooker*, vi. c. vi. 3.

*Explanation.*—As all persons well qualified ought to be admitted to the kingdom of heaven; so neither according to the reason of the thing itself, nor in regard to the general benefit, nor respecting the good of offenders, who without correction would become worse, should some be permitted to remain in the Communion thereof. *Barrow.*

A combination of men made upon any bottom whatsoever, must be supposed to have a right to exclude out of their number such as may be a reproach to it, or a means to dissolve it.

896. Q. What ought to be the method pursued in public penance?

*A.* Dean Nowell's Latin Catechism, a work of qualified authority in the Church of England, says : those who endeavour to injure true piety and to depress religion by the dispersion of false opinions, or to cause serious and public scandal, by a vicious and criminal life, should give public satisfaction to the Church against which the offence is made, i.e., they should ingenuously acknowledge and confess and openly testify their hearty contrition ; that they have so grievously offended Almighty GOD ; that they have, as much as in them lies, treated with ignominy the Christian religion which they profess, the Church of which they were members ; and that not only by their own sinfulness, but also by a pernicious example, they have injured others ; and first from GOD, and afterwards from His Church, they should implore pardon and entreat to be again admitted into the Church and to its sacred mysteries.

The XXXIII. Art. treats of the case of those, who have sinned so grievously, that they have been by the open denunciation of the Church, rightly cut off from the rest of that holy society to which baptism had once admitted them. It mentions also that they may yet " be reconciled by penance and received" again into the Church ; and speaks of a " Judge that hath authority," both to denounce and cut off, and also to receive and reconcile them. It also describes their miserable condition, while in a state of excommunication. This Article therefore involves the whole question of ecclesiastical discipline. *Heathcote.* See Q. 209.

Public penance much to be desired. See *Commination Service*, in which it is declared as follows :

“ Brethren, in the primitive Church,” &c.

It appertaineth to the discipline of the Church that inquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences, and finally being found guilty by just judges, be deprived. Art. XXVI.

897. Q. What is precisely that practice of public penance the restoration of which is declared by the Church of England to be so much to be desired?

A. The practice of public penance was that all notorious sinners should undergo a course of public separation from the body of the faithful in their attendance on Divine Service, humbling themselves and seeking the prayers of the faithful for them, for such time as the nature of their offence seemed to demand by the judgment of the Bishop and assistant priests. Also that those who voluntarily chose to confess their sins, might have opportunity of undergoing penance and receiving absolution; although without public declaration of their crimes if it should be judged expedient to keep them concealed.

Whenever the ancients speak of solemn repentance, they generally mean both the outward ordinance and the inward duty; for they had indeed no notion of their being asunder: so that whether they expressed it by *Poenitentia*, *Exomologesis*, *Metanoia* (*μετάνοια*), or by any other term, they mean by it both what passes within the soul and what appears in the external form of penitential mortification. *Marshall*, 36.

898. Q. Was this practice carried out impartially?

*A. It was practised not only upon mean persons, but also upon the rich, noble, and mighty.*

For instance, upon Theodosius, that puissant and mighty emperor, whom, for committing a grievous and wilful murder, S. Ambrose, a Bishop of Milan, reproved sharply, and did also excommunicate the said emperor, and brought him to open penance. Hom. II. i. p. 183.

Ambrose resolutely withheld his admission to the Church, and the Emperor was content to wait until his humiliation had softened the Bishop and disposed him to absolve the Royal Penitent.

“Perhaps,” says S. Augustine, “for this very reason, GOD in His wise providence, did so order things, that Theodosius the Emperor should do public penance in the face of the Church (since his crime was public, and could not be concealed) that no man for the future, might through shame decline a submission to it.”

Chrysostom in S. Matt. xxvi. Hom. lxxxiii. says: “It is no small penalty which they shall incur, if they suffer any to partake of the Holy Table, whom they know to be guilty of deadly sin, and that the blood of such shall be required at their hands; that, therefore, if any general of an army, consul, or even the emperor himself, should offer to approach under such circumstances, they were boldly to oppose his admission, as being vested for such purposes with a power superior to any earthly potentates.”

Such was the theory—but it must be confessed that it was not always easy to exercise it against the power and influence of princes, though there are not wanting many instances of bold and faithful execution of duty, such as the following.

Mourie, one of the Reguli in those parts, (Llan-

daff,) had treacherously killed a neighbouring prince, whose name was Cynetu, after he had solemnly sworn to a peace with him in the presence of Bishop Oudoceus ; upon which the Bishop proceeded to excommunicate him. Mouric, the offender, after having continued for the space of two years under his sentence humbled himself, and the Bishop assigned him penance, to which he submitted. *Marshall's Penitent. Discipline.*

In 1722, Bishop Wilson, in the discharge of his duty as the guardian of the Sacraments, forbade the governor's wife to approach the Holy Table, as a punishment for a very scandalous calumny which she had disseminated. A clergyman having disobeyed this injunction, he was suspended ; and the result was that the Bishop was illegally seized and imprisoned, with his two vicars-general. The poor were about to level the governor's house to the ground when they were restrained by the voice of their Bishop, &c. *Palmer's Compendious Eccles. Hist.* 293.

899. *Q.* What does S. Paul mean by laying hands suddenly on no man ?

*A.* 1 Tim. v. 22 alludes to the practice of receiving back again offenders into full communion of the Church, re-admittance into this state being signified by that action. *From Barrow.*

Clinics. Concil. Carthag. IV., can. 78. Penitents who in sickness have received the viaticum of the Eucharist, are not to account themselves as absolved without imposition of hands. But Wilson says,

Imposition of hands was not in the Primitive Church the absolution of penitents, but the way

to it; by imposition of hands, sinners were first admitted to penance. Then, in the course of their penance, dismissed with the prayers of the faithful, &c. *Wilson*, v. 555.

They admitted them upon the profession of their repentance, by an imposition of hands, to share in some of the more general parts of the worship, and even in these they stood by themselves, and at a distance from the rest; and when they had passed through several degrees in that state of mourning, they were by steps received back again to the communion of the Church. *Burnet* on Art. XXXIII.

In a note, p. 188, Marshall informs us that, after the catechumens (the most imperfect) were dismissed—then followed after Prayer, the Ener-gumens, or such as were to be exorcised, and then in like manner the competents or such as were just ready for baptism. Then the deacon exhorted the penitents to pray for themselves, and the congregation to intercede for them. They were then dismissed with imposition of hands from the Bishop.

The absolution is the restoration to the full privilege of Christian Communion, but yet this could not be effected without imposition of hands.

The intercession of the priest to God for them, and his imposition of hands upon them, in token of blessing them, were formularies applied to them very often at least, if not in each assembly for solemn worship, throughout the whole course of their penitential separation.

S. Cyprian (Epist. xv.) complains that before their penance has been completed, before Exomologesis or solemn confession of their sin before the Church, before the imposition of hands by

bishop and clergy, offering was made for them and the Eucharist given.

Imposition of hands was the solemn ceremony of sacerdotal benediction, wherein the less was blessed of the greater.

For although absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sins, yet by the express word of the New Testament, it hath not this promise annexed and tied to the visible sign, which is imposition of hands. *Hom. 388.*

900. Q. How were excommunicate persons to be treated by the general body of Christians?

A. Art. XXXIII. That person which by open denunciation of the Church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church and excommunicate, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as a heathen and a publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and be received into the Church by a judge that hath authority thereunto.

S. Matt. xviii. 17. If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee (*and consequently unto the whole Church*) as an heathen man and a publican.

That is, let him be reduced unto the state of infidels, as he was before baptism. Which may be done by judicial authority, which GOD declares He will ratify. So that there is the same authority for excommunication as for baptism. And if one is a real privilege, the other is a real punishment. *Wilson, v. 173.*

The primitive Christians were not allowed to salute any one that was excommunicated. *Capital. Carol. Magni (nec ejus, &c.,) Wilson, v. 174.*

Agreeably with which S. John teaches. (2 S. John 10, 11.) If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.

Not to show our abhorrence of sin is to consent to it. Men do not sufficiently consider the guilt of this, when they converse with notorious offenders without scruple. They partake with them in their sins; they harden the sinner; they forget the fidelity they owe to God, and to His laws, and greatly hazard their own salvation. *Wilson, v. 174.*

901. Q. How far has it been considered possible in these times that such a system of discipline could be carried out?

A. A penitential office has been reckoned among the things which are wanting to us, that if any are willing of their own accord to rank themselves in the class of public penitents, they may thence be directed in their religious intention, and led as it were, by the hand, to the ministry of reconciliation.

Or if any shall be found deserving of a judicial censure by public enormous crimes, and shall submit to discipline, and in a becoming manner desire a re-admission, that the way to this may be chalked out to them and remission of sins be obtained by the Church. *Marshall, 4.*

902. Q. State plainly what you conceive to be the uses of Church discipline.

A. Church discipline is for the honour of God, for the safety of religion, the good of sinners, and

for the public weal, that Christians may not run headlong to ruin without being made sensible of their danger, and that judgments may not be poured down upon the whole community. *Wilson.*

*Texts.*—Gal. v. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 17; S. Jude 23; 1 Cor. v. 2, 5, 7; 2 Cor. ii. 1—3.

1 Tim. v. 20. Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear. That is, who sin grievously, and are convinced before two or three witnesses: let such be censured before, or by all the congregation. *Wilson*, v. 181.

*Note.*—“Did not Achan commit a trespass, and wrath fall on all the community?” *Wilson*, v. 182.

When men will not take care of their own salvation, the Church owes this care to her children, to hinder them as much as possible from ruining others. *Wilson*, v. 181.

Excommunication never pronounced except where the case was desperate, by the obstinacy of the party in refusing admonition, and to submit to discipline. *See Marshall's Penit. Disc.* 32, 33, 48, 87.

Instead of taking it ill that you are called to an account for your offences, you ought to be glad and very thankful that the Church takes notice of you, and is concerned for your welfare. As a man who has a wound or an ulcer, is pleased to find people of judgment ready and willing to help and to cure him. *Wilson.*

If excommunication is perpetual, it is caused by the obstinacy of the offender, not by the law of CHRIST or His Church; which only deprive wicked men of the benefit of Communion for a time, to bring them to a sense of their duty. (2 Thess. iii. 6, 14; 1 Tim. i. 20; 1 Cor. xvi. 22.)

Excommunication is only for the contumacious, not to insult but to cure.

Since we are to give an account of the souls committed to our charge, we cannot be debarred from making use of all the means enjoined us by the Gospel to reduce sinners. *Wilson.*

903. Q. What further Scriptural evidence have you to point out to the same effect on this subject?

A. S. Paul says, that the power which was bestowed upon him by CHRIST, according to which he might upon occasion use persons severely, was for edification and not for destruction, that the extreme punishment inflicted (re-delivery to Satan, 1 Tim. i. 20, in effect, excommunication,) was for destruction of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved in the Day of Judgment.

*Note.*—Gal. vi. 1; καταρτίσετε τὸν τοιοῦτον, restore, re-establish—set in a right and entire state such an one. Also 2 Thess. iii. 14, and 2 Cor. ii. 7, 8, 10; 2 Cor. xiii. 10.

### *The Resurrection of the Body.*

904. Q. What is the derivation of the word Resurrection?

A. From the Latin. *Re*, again, and *surrexi*, perf. tense of *surgo*, I rise.

905. Q. Was the expression of the early creeds always “the resurrection of the body?”

A. No; it was always both in the Greek and Latin creeds “resurrection of the flesh,” and

the Church of Aquileia, "this flesh," meaning "this very flesh of men."

906. Q. Is it so retained in any of our formulæries?

A. In the creed used in the offices of public baptism.

*Note.*—In the Athanasian Creed, it is, "At Whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies."

907. Q. What truths are we to consider the use of the words "flesh" and "body" to convey?

A. By "flesh," is to be understood the flesh of men and not any other flesh; according to the distinction of S. Paul, "there is one flesh of men and another of fishes," &c. And by "body," one recognisable as the same body which existed before it was by death separated from the soul.

*Note.*—Called also the resurrection "of the dead," or "from the dead," (*ἐκ νεκρῶν*), and "being born from the dead," (made alive or quickened,) which expressions must refer not to the soul, but to the person of man as consisting of both body and soul, since the mere continuance of our souls in being could not be said to be raised up; and men could only be said to rise again in respect to that part which had ceased to be. Rom. iv. 17; viii. 11, 23; Heb. xi. 19; Dan. xii. 2. *Barrow.*

908. Q. What peculiar difficulties has the doctrine of the resurrection of our bodies beyond those which seem to obstruct the belief of the resurrection of our **LORD**?

A. The body of our **LORD** never saw corrup-

tion, but all other human bodies, after the soul has deserted them, become subject to dissolution and decay.

909. *Q.* Explain your meaning more clearly.

*A.* All the parts of the body being fully dissolved into dust and then mingled with the surrounding earth, and sometimes scattered widely asunder from one another; the difficulty of the restoration of the body under such circumstances would seem to be greater than would attend the resurrection of a body but the third day lying dead.

910. *Q.* What then are we notwithstanding bound to believe?

*A.* That the bodies of men, whatever be the difficulties with which the subject is surrounded, will hereafter be united to their own souls.

911. *Q.* How far did the Jews receive this doctrine?

*A.* It was revealed, although perhaps obscurely, to the patriarchs.

When Elijah was taken up alive into heaven, this must surely give an expectation, that the body as well as the soul was to partake of future happiness. *Secker.*

*Note.*—S. Paul (Heb. xi. 19) affirms that Abraham believed that God was able to raise up his son even from the dead, and therefore was willing to offer him in sacrifice. Again he says (Heb. xi. 35) that “Women received their dead raised to life again,” and that “others accepted not deliverance that they might obtain a *better* resurrection.” It was more clearly declared under the later Jews. Dan. xii. 2.

Consider also the famous passage in Job xix. 25, 26. Bishop Patrick and others maintained that this text only spoke of God's interposition in his favour before he died; but Pearson and the best commentators show that the expressions themselves are not suitable to the notion of temporal restitution.

1. The introduction, "O that my words," &c., at vv. 23, 24, are only fit for some such solemn subject as the Declaration of the Redeemer's Advent and the Resurrection, and not to usher in the prophecy of any man's restoration to wealth.

2. The title which he gives to Him on Whom he depends, the Redeemer, shows that he understands it of CHRIST; the time expressed denotes the futurition at the latter day; the description of that Redeemer standing on the earth, represents the judge of the quick and the dead, and "seeing God with his eyes" declares his belief in the incarnation.

3. The Pharisees, before and after CHRIST's coming, laboured to prove the Resurrection, but made the leas way with the Sadducees as they gave up this text because of its acknowledgment of the Messias.

See also 2 Macc. vii. 10—33.

912. Q. In what promise is the doctrine of the Resurrection probably implied?

A. That the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, destroy his power, and consequently take away the curse under which he had brought mankind. For as part of the curse consists in the death of the body, it cannot be completely taken away, but by the resurrection of the body. *Secker.*

*Explanation.*—“Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.” The body had been therefore qualified for immortality, and was appointed to it. That it should return to dust would have been no punishment or privation, if it were destined to suffer corruption and dissolution by natural law. Sin brought death into the world, temporal and eternal, and the former must be triumphed over as well as the latter.

913. *Q.* Did our SAVIOUR and His Apostles sanction the view that the Resurrection was known to the Patriarchs?

*A.* 1. Our SAVIOUR said that the Sadducees erred not knowing the Scriptures, i.e. of course the Old Testament Scriptures which therefore witness of the doctrine. S. Matt. xxii. 29.

*Note.*—The question of the Sadducees implied that they were finding arguments to answer the doctrine of a bodily resurrection.

2. From GOD’s being known to them as the GOD of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob, our SAVIOUR teaches us to conclude that they knew the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, since GOD is not the GOD of the dead but of the living; i.e. not the GOD of a mere defunct body, but of the whole man—the body in sleep—the soul awaiting in hope the day of Judgment. S. Matt. xxii. 31, 32. So also S. Luke xx. 27, &c.

*Note.*—S. Paul speaking the language of a Pharisee to Pharisees declared that he held the resurrection, Acts xxiii. 6. Certain believed that John the Baptist was risen from the *dead*. S. Luke ix. 7, 8.

After such evidence it is marvellous that learned men should have attempted to disprove the belief among the Jews of this doctrine.

914. Q. What miraculous testimonies were given to the resurrection of the dead in the Old Testament?

A. 1 Kings xvii. 22; 2 Kings iv. 34, 35; xiii. 21.

*Note.*—All these were instances of persons resuscitated who were only recently dead.

The power of the dead bones of Elisha, however, indirectly indicates the virtue of the resurrection principle in the bodies of the saints.

915. Q. And what instances are recorded under the New Testament?

A. S. Mark v. 41, 42; S. Luke viii. 55; vii. 12, 14, 15; S. John xi. 39, 43, 44; Acts xx. 10. Eutychus.

*Note.*—The repossession of the same terrestrial body by its soul to live temporarily in this earth is a far different thing from the restoration of the body to the soul for its abode in the new heavens and earth. It must be borne in mind therefore that it is only an argument from analogy,—no proof.

916. Q. With what great event as correlative evidence of the resurrection was our SAVIOUR's death accompanied?

A. At His death as showing how triumphantly He had overcome death, many bodies (not many spirits, we must observe) of the saints which slept arose.

**Note.**—Moses and Elias, from their being present at the Transfiguration, were living persons at this time—the latter certainly in the body, and it is difficult to conceive that it would be otherwise with the former, as called to the same honour. The search for the body of Elijah was doubtless intended to show its complete removal in the chariot of fire.

Then of Moses it is said, the LORD buried him in the valley, and no man knew of the place of his burial.

How soon afterwards he was called to join Enoch, who like Elijah was translated into heaven, we cannot say; but we can scarcely believe otherwise than that this was an appearance in the flesh, since Elijah's was so.

**917. Q.** What Scriptural expression used of the death of patriarchs, &c., implies the resurrection?

**A.** The word “sleep” must be applied to the body, as it can hardly be applied to the soul.

**Note.**—The patriarchs “fell on sleep.” The kings of Israel and Judah are represented as “sleeping with their fathers.”

Our SAVIOUR says, “the damsel is not dead, but sleepeth.” It is also of the body (as before pointed out) that it is said that “many of the bodies of the saints which slept arose.” Again, our SAVIOUR is “the first-fruits of them that slept.”

**918. Q.** Was CHRIST's resurrection a proof of the resurrection of the dead?

**A.** By Himself rising from the dead He thus gave an actual testimony to the resurrection. 1 Cor. xv. 12; Acts xvii. 31; Rom. xiv. 9.

919. Q. And was CHRIST's resurrection any more than a proof?

A. It was also a cause of our resurrection. 1 Cor. xv. 20, 21; Col. i. 18; Rev. i. 18.

920. Q. Were there any indications among the heathen of such a belief?

A. The Mehestani, disciples of Zoroaster, believed in the immortality of the soul and in the resurrection of the body. See Zend-Avesta. Compare Ezek. xxxvii. 1, but generally the philosophers of old while they believed in the immortality of the soul entirely rejected the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. Acts xvii. 18, 32.

*Note.*—Pliny speaks of it (Nat. Hist. ii. 7) as “a thing impossible to be performed, puerile deliramentum, a childish extravagance.” Bereft of any such hope, the educated Greek and Roman did not bury their dead, but burnt their bodies to ashes.

A more ancient tradition however seemed to teach them the higher destiny of the body. This was the connection of their passage to Elysium, with the rites of burial or a due honouring of the body.

Hor. Carm. xxviii. 23, 35.

In Eurip. Polydorus complains that he is *άταφος*. The shades of the unburied wander on the shores of Styx before they can be received into Charon's boat, evidently a relic of an earlier tradition than urn-burial.

The practice of the Israelites in showing great regard for the body in its burial and that of the Egyptians by preserving the bodies of their dead as Mummies, as contrasted with that of other nations who burnt their bodies to ashes, seem to

indicate some tradition derived from early sources. Regarded in this point of view, the custom of barbarous nations in burying with food and the hunter's spear, is not so foolish as at first thought it might be deemed.

921. *Q.* What curious and instructive sign was used in Christian symbolism to teach the resurrection?

*A.* The Phœnix with a glory of rays was used to signify the glorified body in the resurrection.

S. Clemens Romanus says: "Let us consider that wonderful type of the resurrection which is seen in the eastern countries; that is to say in Arabia. There is a certain bird called a phœnix; of this there is never but one at a time, and that lives five hundred years; and when the time of its dissolution draws near that it must die, it makes itself a nest of frankincense and myrrh and other spices; into which, when its time is fulfilled, it enters and dies. But its flesh putrifying, breeds a certain worm which being nourished with the juice of the dead bird, brings forth feathers; and when it is grown to a perfect state, it takes up the nest in which the bones of its parent lie, and carries it from Arabia into Egypt, to a city called Heliopolis: and flying in open day, in the sight of all men, lays it upon the altar of the sun, and so returns from whence it came. The priests then search into the records of the time; and find that it returned precisely at the end of five hundred years. And shall we think it to be any very great and strange thing for the **LORD** of all to raise up them that religiously serve Him in the assurance of a good faith, when even by a bird He shows us the greatness of His power to fulfil His

promise? For he says in a certain place, 'Thou shalt raise me up, and I shall confess unto Thee,' (Ps. iii. 5.) And again, 'I laid me down and slept and awakened up again, because the LORD sustained me.' And again, Job says, (ix. 27,) 'Thou shalt raise up this flesh of mine that has suffered all these things.' *S. Clement*, First Ep. to Cor. xxv. xxvi.

We see the phoenix with a glory of rays round its head perched upon the palm-tree, the Tree of Life as a symbol of the resuscitated and glorified body, in the mosaics of various Roman Apsides, as in those of the churches of the saints Cosma and Damiano. Weston saw a similar bird perched upon the Tree of Life in the paradise represented in the apsis of S. Giovanni Laterano. Dr. Barlow also says, "When the palm-tree has decayed, the Arabs cut it down to the roots, and burn it on the spot; and the ashes being covered with a layer of earth, a new shoot springs up which in the course of a few years, becomes a strong tree. It would seem that we have here the origin of the fabled phoenix being renewed from the flames that consumed it, as the bird and the tree bear the same name.

Sir Thomas Browne, among his erudite guesses, describes the phoenix as a bird of Paradise, "and alike the emblem of the resurrection of the soul;" again, "that it was a palm-tree, and that it was only a mistake upon the pronouncing of the Greek word phoenix, φοῖνιξ, which signifies a palm-tree." *Welby's Mysteries*.

922. *Q.* Why did the philosophers think the resurrection of the body impossible?

*A.* Because they thought that they could observe no operation in nature, producing any such

effect as, that corrupted, dissolved and dissipated bodies should be revived.

923. Q. Why do we think their judgment faulty?

A. Because we observe that the same body of living creatures dies and is reproduced under an improved form.

*Illustration.*—A priori, no connection would have been supposed to exist between the sluggish grub and the beautiful winged fly which we see upon our rivers. Man himself passes through various changes,—from the embryo to his fully developed state.

See Mrs. Gatty's very beautiful and instructive story, "Not lost, but gone before," in "Parables from Nature."

924. Q. What are the general analogies for the resurrection of our bodies?

A. Day and night, spring and winter, seed and harvest-time, represent, as it were, the possibilities of a general resurrection.

He that makes the rising sun to end the darkness of the night, and the flourishing spring to renew the face of millions of plants which seemed in the winter to be dead, and the buried little seed to spring up to a beautiful plant and flower, or a strong and goodly tree, has power and skill enough to raise our bodies by ways unknown to foolish man. *Baxter.* W. C. I., i. 343.

All nature subsists by continual vicissitudes of life and death. See examples in *Pearson*, 634.

Let us contemplate, beloved, the resurrection that is continually made before our eyes. Day and night manifests a resurrection to us. The

night lies down, and the day arises; again the day departs, and the night comes on. Let us behold the fruits of the earth: everyone sees how the seed is sown: the sower goes forth, and casts it upon the earth, and the seed which when it was sown, fell upon the earth dry and naked, in time dissolves; and from the dissolution the great power of the providence of the LORD raises it again and of one seed many arise and bring forth much fruit. *S. Clement Rom.*

925. Q. What, then, is the argument to be drawn from this constant perishing and restoration of nature?

A. Merely the argument from analogy, i.e. that apart from all assurance in Scripture, there is no reason to conclude from anything we know already, but rather the contrary, that the body of man which decays and dies may not revive again.

926. Q. Why is there nothing in the creed of the immortality of the soul and of its state in the unseen world before the resurrection?

A. 1. The resurrection of the body is a thing not known at all by nature, but only by supernatural revelation, and therefore is an article of mere belief: but the immortality, or future life of souls, is a point which the light of nature reveals: and therefore was taken both by Jews and sober heathens, as a truth of common notice: even as the love of ourselves is not expressed in the Ten Commandments, but only the love of GOD and others, because it was a thing pre-supposed.

2. The immortality of the soul is included in this article of the resurrection of the body: for if the soul continue not, the next at the resur-

rection would be *another* soul, and a new created one, and not the same: and then the body would not be the same soul's body, nor the man the same man, but another. *Baxter.*

All the whole gospel that promises life to the sanctified, does prove the immortality of the soul: for if the soul perish, no man that lived on earth is saved; for if the soul be not the man, it is most certainly the prime essential part of the man.

Again: If it be another soul that must be judged, which never was in that body before, nor ever did anything in that body, how shall it be judged for that which it never did? *Baxter.*

927. Q. Did not the religious systems of the philosophers of old comprise a belief in the immortality of the soul?

A. Yes; as being a foundation of receiving reward and punishment for men's deeds in this life it has been, in all religions, deemed a necessary principle, as alike exciting to virtue, and deterring from wickedness, and the most satisfactory ground of resolving difficulties concerning the providence of GOD. *Barrow on Creed.*

We have no reason to imagine the soul made up of parts, though the body is. So far as the acutest reasoners are able to judge, what perceives and wills must be one uncompounded substance. And not being compounded, it cannot be dissolved, and therefore probably cannot die. *Secker.*

Secker also quotes Cic. Tusc. Disp. i. 29, "We think by the consent of all nations that souls continue to exist."

Now this so universal agreement must surely have arisen from an inward principle of nature, dictating to all persons that they are designed for a future existence ; and that as they are plainly creatures accountable for their actions, yet often do not account here, they must expect to do it hereafter. *Secker*, who further intimates an origin of the belief in tradition.

928. Q. Did Cicero or Socrates before him have perfect confidence of its truth ?

A. They were not so confident in their arguments as to be freed from all doubt concerning it. The certainty we owe to CHRIST Who brought life and immortality to light. 2 Tim. i. 10.

929. Q. What texts of Scripture prove that the soul lives when it is separated from the body ?

A. 1. When Saul would have Samuel raised to speak with him, it plainly implies that it was then the common belief of the Jews that separated souls survive.

2. The same souls came into all those bodies which were raised again.

3. CHRIST tells us that men cannot kill the soul.

930. Q. What then does Christianity assure us of concerning the soul ?

A. That our souls do not vanish into nothing after death, but return unto God's hand and the place by Him appointed for them, there continuing in that life which is proper for a soul. *Barrow* on Creed. See supra 499 to 506.

*Note.*—Far from clear or consoling is the manner in which generally speaking the dead are

spoken of in the Old Testament Scriptures. Job x. 21; Ps. vi. 5; lxxxviii. 11; cxv. 17; Isa. xxxviii. 18; 1 Sam. xxviii. 7; Eccles. iii. 21; xii. 7.

931. Q. What are the arguments from reason for the belief in the existence of the soul in a future state?

A. There would be no reason to conclude that the soul dies because the body dies, but since we know that it can survive so many changes of the body, this alone affords a fair probability that it may survive the great change of death.

*Explanation.*—That part of us which judges and resolves, loves and hates, rejoices and grieves, we call the mind or soul. Plainly this is not the body. Neither our limbs, nor our trunk, nor even our head, is what understands and reasons and writes, and likes and dislikes, but something that hath its abode within the head and is unseen.

Our bodies increase from an inconceivable smallness, to a very large bulk and waste away again; and are changing each part of them more or less every day. Our souls we know continue all this while the same. Our limbs may be cut off—all feeling and motion lost throughout the body, as in the case of an universal palsy, and yet the soul not suffer. And though some diseases disorder the mind, there is no appearance that any have a tendency to destroy it. On the contrary, health accompanies a disordered understanding, and the most fatal distempers are attended to the moment of death with vigour of understanding.

The body is an instrument adapted to the soul. The latter is our proper self: the former is but

something joined to us for a time. And though during that time, the connection is very close, yet nothing hinders, but we may be as well after the separation of our soul from our present body, as we were before, if not *better.* (*Doubtful.*) *Secker.* (He corrects himself, see pp. 321, 322.)

932. Q. Is it quite evident that the state after death is not one of insensibility but happiness?

A. Since our SAVIOUR describes the soul of Lazarus as lying in Abraham's bosom, (S. Luke xvi. 22, 25;) since He promised the penitent thief, that he should that day be with Him in Paradise, (S. Luke xxiii. 43,) and S. Paul speaks of being present with CHRIST as the immediate consequence of death and far better than this life; therefore the state of those who die in the LORD, (2 Cor. v. 8; Phil. i. 23,) is now a state not of insensibility, but of happiness.

933. Q. What is the nature of that happiness?

A. They are blessed in resting from their labours; not that they are in a state of inactivity, but that the exercise of their energies is attended with pleasure only and no sense of toil or labour.

*Note.*—The sense of toil and labour one portion of the change from Paradise to the world. “In the sweat of their brow they were to eat bread.”

“And thus when we go out of this world, we may pass into new scenes, and a new state of life and action, just as naturally as we came into the present. And this new state may naturally be a social one. And the advantages of it, advantages of every kind may naturally be bestowed, according to some fixed general laws of wisdom, upon

every one in proportion to the degrees of his virtue."—*Butler*.

934. Q. Is not the acknowledgment of a separate state of souls somewhat like an assertion of purgatory?

A. The texts alleged in support of purgatory are,—1. S. Matt. xii. 31; 2. S. Matt. v. 26; 3. 1 S. Pet. iii. 18—20; 4. 1 Cor. iii. 10—15.

1. The meaning of "the world to come," is evidently not "the separate state," the sin then is not to have forgiveness at all. 2. The *last* farthing does not imply that it ever will or can be paid. 3. The Spirit strove with them on earth. Those spirits in prison to whom CHRIST by His Spirit preached, who were disobedient in the days of Noah, for their disobedience were not sent to Purgatory but to a worse place. 4. The fire here alludes not to purgatorial fire, but to the Judgment Day, when the LORD shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire to judge the world and to try "every man's" work.

935. Q. But did not many of the ancient Christians pray for the dead?

A. They prayed only for the completion of their happiness, whom they apprehended to be already in Paradise: it was for the apostles, saints and martyrs, for the Blessed Virgin herself, whom they certainly did not think to be in Purgatory. *Secker*.

Observe, that if they prayed *for* them, they did not pray *to* them. Purgatory then, is nothing but an imaginary place, invented by men, to give bad persons hope, and good persons dread, of

being put into it ; that they may get what they can from both, by pretending to deliver them out of it again. Whereas, "The souls of the righteous are in the hands of the LORD ; and there shall no torment touch them."

See in connection with this subject Question 776 and following.

936. Q. Describe the state of the wicked in the state before the judgment.

A. As they are hereafter to be with the devils, we may justly believe they are like them, now delivered into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment, (2 S. Pet. ii. 4,) and are instantly after death, in some manner suitable to souls, to be tormented, (S. Luke xvi. 25.) Undoubtedly the loss of their past pleasures and gains, remorse for their past follies and crimes, despair of pardon and the fearful looking for of that judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour them, (Heb. x. 27,) cannot but make their intermediate state intensely miserable.

937. Q. We have thus seen the state of the argument from Scriptural and general testimony, and we are positively assured that the soul is rejoined by the same body ; our inquiry must now be to ascertain what is understood by the *same* body. And first, would there be any predisposition on the part of man to desire the reunion of his body with his soul ?

A. No man contemplating his own body with that inquiring and reverential awe which he felt who said, "I am fearfully and wonderfully made," but he either secretly or openly wishes that this

very same body in all its distinct identity may be restored to him again.

*Note.*—So S. Paul, 2 Cor. v. 1—10; Rom. viii. 23.

938. Q. On what grounds would his desires rest?

*A.* He is a man compounded of body and soul, of whose union he has experience, but of whose disunion he has none, and he therefore does not wish to be a mere bodiless soul.

939. Q. Is the union necessary in the nature of his immortality?

*A.* Having received the seed of immortality as man of perfect body and perfect soul, he cannot complete his immortality without living eternally in both.

The souls of men as they are immaterial, so they are immortal, and being once created by the Father of spirits, they become a subsistence for eternity; the body is framed by the same God to be a companion for his spirit, and a man born into the world consists of these two. *Pearson*, 632.

1. It will be God's glory to make and bless a perfect man.

2. It will be our perfection: a whole man is more perfect than a soul alone. *Baxter*. W. C. I. 1, 341.

940. Q. What further do you remark?

*A.* That whereas much happiness may be within the reach of a disembodied soul, it is yet certain that it cannot perfectly realise without the

body many delightful sensations which are to be experienced only through its medium.

The disembodied soul is not in its full perfection ; and it is a degree of punishment to be in a state of separation : but you cannot call it a pain as to sense, because it has an unspeakable glory, though not the most perfect. *Baxter.* W. C. I. vol. i. 341.

*Note.*—One of our sustaining hopes is that there will be in the next life a state in which those who for their honesty, integrity, and goodness, are conspicuous here, will find all that is disproportionate in this life and adverse to them, adjusted by a righteous GOD Who will do honour to their holy lives and justify them in the sight of the world. Now all that is adverse and incongruous has taken place in conjunction with the body—how then without the body will it be adjusted ?

941. Q. Does there seem any further argument arising out of the necessary relation of the body and the soul ?

A. Man being left by his Maker at liberty to make his choice between good and evil, and his actions having a tendency to affect both soul and body with the greatest blessings for what he has done well, and punishments for what he has done ill in either, it would seem a necessary consequence that he should rise from the dead to enjoy in the body the fruits of a life of righteousness or to receive in the same the necessary results of a life of wickedness.

*Note*—GOD has made man—for what purpose ?—to glorify Himself in a new creation, the raising

matter incorporated with the soul to a higher spiritual existence than could have otherwise been produced. (See note to 942 Q. "God may easily," &c.)

It was certainly a great experiment that God should try to reduce the passions and infirmities of the body under the mastery and dominion of the spirit. Our LORD JESUS CHRIST, the Second Adam—the first Adam having failed in doing this—showed us how it was to be done in His own Person. God's wisdom in creating man, and in expecting of his compound nature high and spiritual results, was to be justified before all His creatures—the Angelic and the Satanic hosts—good men and bad. If in effecting this great marvel of creative power He chooses to incur the risk of subjecting to eternal torments all those who from neglect come short of that divine existence which He offers to them—is He to be accounted unjust or unmerciful?—or rather, would it not be unjust to those who would willingly avail themselves of His designed benefits, if because some might fail of attaining them and might wilfully and consciously injure themselves to all eternity, He were to deprive others of all opportunity of winning so high a reward.

**942. Q.** Might not the natural consequences of a life of wickedness be spared to the wicked by denying to him the resurrection of the body?

**A.** It is hardly possible to understand how a law of God could be made so diverse in its operation and effects as that the good should only rise again. The Scripture however comes to the aid of our reason, and plainly tells us, that "there shall be a resurrection of the flesh, that

every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. v. 10.

*Note.*—See also S. John v. 28; Dan. xii. 2.

The evil are to come forth to a resurrection of damnation. Both good and evil would here appear to be promised a continuance of that life to which they are raised. They are raised both for judgment. Is it probable that one party of them would, by some special intercession of God, be suffered or adjudged only to pass into annihilation. But from the prophet Daniel we learn that some rise "to everlasting life and some to everlasting shame and contempt." Can that be everlasting which is only to last during the judgment? for when they are annihilated it will no longer be felt. But from S. Mark ix. 42, and following verses, we learn that the wicked do suffer punishment (at least) of some kind which is continuous and never ending: a truth represented in the words, "the fire that never shall be quenched."

What must be the consequence of telling men that to the good the body will rise to eternal life, but to the evil their punishment would be only annihilation of body and soul? It is impossible to conclude otherwise than that a strong motive to good would have been withdrawn in the removal of those natural fears of punishment deterring from evil, which, apart from all question of material pains, are the presumed consequents in another world of a wicked life here; and how do we know but that as well the fears of punishment as the incentives of rewards are necessary, in the general, to all men, to induce their perseverance. Let it be known that only annihilation is to be feared as the result of a life

of wickedness or pleasure and indolence, and it is plain that men would really by so much be weakened in their pursuit of all those objects and attainments which would best prepare them in this life for another and higher existence. This at least is a presumption that we interpret Scripture rightly when we conclude from the direct meaning of its words that to the evil as well as to the good the resurrection will be of everlasting duration, and that there is no such thing for human beings as annihilation.

A man cannot believe that he has a "body which shall rise again" to care for, if he knows that on his abuse of it, will follow shortly after it *has* risen, annihilation. This is not to have a resurrection body, and therefore he would not have been put in charge of any such responsibility. No man's fears of loss or evil consequences can be duly appealed to if merely nihility is to succeed his sentence of condemnation at the great day. Having such a result in anticipation a man's sense of responsibility would be deadened, and it is clear that none would have fair trial whose affections were not quickened by terrors of failure as real as are his hopes of success.

Nor can we with reason think that the soul alone shall undergo those sufferings, because the laws which were given to us are not made in respect of that alone, but have most frequent reflection in the body without which in this life the soul can neither do nor suffer anything.  
*Pearson.*

GOD may easily have many reasons for restoring our bodies which we apprehend not; besides those which, in some measure, we do apprehend: that the soul of man, being originally, and in the state of innocence, united to a body, is probably

capable of completer perception and action, and consequently of higher degrees of reward or punishment, in that state, than a separate one; or at least will be so, with such a body as in the next life shall be allotted to it. *Secker.*

*Note.*—It might be in the nature of things impossible that GOD could reward the good whether in the body or in the soul without punishing by the very same laws the wicked. A body, we will suppose, has become perfected in its use and powers in this world—inaluable habits of the mind and of the affections, one might say even of physical aptitudes, have been formed in conjunction with the body, habits which have been assiduously cultivated and are become a second nature. Is the body which gives point and meaning to the exercise of those powers and affections to be thrown away? In other words, can they be exercised, in any efficient degree, apart from the body? Is not its owner to be rewarded with its continued possession and delighted use in the more perfect state to which he has attained?

What sufferings the soul by itself can undergo we do not well know. Our SAVIOUR exclaims in the highest ecstasy of His passion, “My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death,” but it was the weakness of the body that rendered the suffering so intense: “My *bones* are all out of joint; My *bowels* within Me are like melting wax:” but shame and praise act upon the body, and bring the consciousness of those affections into existence.

That the eye should not see the bodily form of another, the arms not embrace, the bowels not yearn over the beloved, the hands not skill to fashion a work, and all the members not give

themselves to exercise amid the labours of God,—we cannot enter without dread and abhorrence into the vacuum which such a speculation presents.

A particular satisfaction is promised to himself in the future kingdom of the Redeemer by Job when he says: "Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another," i.e. that he shall see Him in the flesh.

On the other hand, a body has become ruined by the ill use made of it—are the sufferings of the soul alone to be the consequences; and if so how, in the soul, are the natural results of sin and neglect to be averted? Must there be a special interposition of Providence leaving the soul without a body; or must God to be a merciful God deviate from the course of His Divine Providence and make a special decree for those bodies to be afterwards annihilated to which He has appointed a general law of resurrection?

943. Q. If the resurrection of the dead is impossible, in what respect must it be so?

A. Either because it is a work of so much difficulty that there neither is nor can be any agent to affect it; or else because the soul is so far separated by death from the body that they are absolutely incapable of being united. *Pearson.*

944. Q. But there is no failure on the part of the agent?

A. Neither from insufficiency of knowledge or of power. S. Luke i. 37.

Nothing can be impossible with God which does not involve a contradiction. And there can be no contradiction in this, that he which was and

now is not, should hereafter be what before he was. *Jer. xxxii. 17.*

945. *Q.* Explain then how it is thought that the soul is so far by death separated from the body that they are absolutely by death incapable of being united.

*A.* It is thought that the body of a man, being frequently, as after battles, imperfectly buried, is exposed to have its several parts scattered and variously disposed of, as converted into fertilising substances, or being cast into the sea and become the food of fishes, and so passing again into human bodies and becoming component parts of them, cannot be employed to reconstitute the bodies they originally belonged to, if they are to remain component parts of those which they at present adhere to.

But the body is in continual flux or change; we have not the same flesh this year that we had the last: and as a man in a consumption loses before death the mass of flesh in which he did good or evil: shall all that rise again which every day vanishes? . . . You know not how you were generated in the womb, and yet you know that you were there made. And must God teach you how you shall be raised before you will believe it? Must He answer all your doubts of the flesh that is vanished, or the bodies eaten by other bodies, and teach you all His unsearchable skill, before you will take His word for true? *Baxter.* *W. C. I. i. 343.*

946. *Q.* And yet we are taught that the *same* flesh will be raised again. Why is it necessary

that the form of expression should be adhered to in order to the retention of the doctrine?

*A.* Because if the same body should be joined to another soul or the same soul should be united to another body, it would not be the resurrection of the same man.

As our bodies while we live, are really distinguished from all other creatures, as the body of every particular man is different from the bodies of all other men, as no other substance whatsoever is vitally united to the soul of that man whose body it is while he liveth, so no substance of any other creature, no body of any other man, shall be vitally reunited unto the soul at the resurrection. *Pearson.*

947. *Q.* Is this doctrine of the identity of the raised body with that which was placed in the earth asserted in the Scripture?

*A.* Job xix. 26, 27; Rom. viii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 53.

Pearson quotes Dan. xii. 2; S. John v. 28; Rev. xx. 13; but says, neither the sea nor the grave would give up their dead, if the same bodies did not rise from the one and the other.

948. *Q.* In the resurrection why is the resurrection of the *body* implied?

*A.* At the death of man nothing falleth but his body, the spirit goeth upward, (Eccles. ii. 21,) and no other body falls but his own to rise again.

1 Cor. xv. 53. This corruptible and this mortal which is to put on, &c., is the same body which dieth because mortal, and is corrupted because corruptible.

**949. Q.** How further is this identity shown?

**A.** By those bodies which will never rise because it has never been their lot to die.

*Illustration.*—As in the translation of Enoch and those (the quick) mentioned by S. Paul, 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17. If those which are alive shall be caught up as they are, alive with the same bodies, only changed into glorified and spiritual bodies, i.e. with the same bodies spiritualised and glorified, (1 Cor. xv.); certainly those which were dead shall rise out of their graves to life in the same bodies, that they also may appear in them before the Judge of the quick and dead. Acts x. 42.

That the same body which died shall rise again, See S. Matt. xxvii. 52, 53. So our Saviour's body, S. John ii. 19; S. Luke xxiv. 39; Phil. iii. 21.

**950. Q.** It seems then that there must be a perfect identity of flesh and body, and yet the body which perishes in the grave or at sea cannot be preserved or restored intact as we have seen. What considerations will enable us to reconcile these apparent contradictions?

**A.** An important one is—that to maintain the doctrine of the resurrection, it is not necessary to believe that all the very same particles of matter with which a man dies must of necessity be restored to him with his resuscitated body.

Whether we are to rise with the same bodies we lie down with in the grave; whereby we mean the numerical body with the same matter and the same particles: This is a most celebrated question though, in my opinion, more curious than

necessary; it is not of any great consequence to us whether we shall have the same particles or others of equal dignity and value, or what shall become of our cast off carcases, when we shall live in light with angels. *Dr. Burnet. Welby's Mysteries.*

*Note.*—Forcibly but not reverently put, for our bodies should be something more to us than "cast off carcases," supposing the resurrection.

This sameness need not be considered as implying the necessary identity of *every particle which was there at the time of death*,—but merely the restitution of the same organization to as much of the former stamina as may be sufficient to constitute corporeal identity. *Dr. Mill's Analysis of Pearson.*

Mill confesses that Pearson conceives himself concerned in insisting on the material identity of all the particles that composed the body at the time of dissolution, which were not themselves numerically the same with those which constituted it an hour before: and claims to take up an opinion less pregnant with obvious difficulties than that of his wise and able guide:

951. Q. On the other hand how shall we be able to satisfy the words of the Creeds?

A. By showing that to believe in the resurrection of the flesh, "this flesh," "my flesh," "this body," "the dead," is not necessarily to believe in the resurrection of every particle of matter with which we die adhering to us in our last sickness.

We have no way of determining by experience what is the certain bulk of the living being each man calls himself: and yet till it be determined that it is larger in bulk than the solid elementary

particles of matter, which there is no ground to think any natural power can dissolve, &c. *Butler's Analogy.*

A second consideration is that it is not even necessary that the vision of the valley of bones in Ezek. xxxvii. 7, 8, 10, should be realised literally.

Pearson observes, "in the resurrection we cannot suppose the bones in the valley, for they are dissolved into dust as well as the other parts."

3rd. Nor is it necessary that a man should appear in the next world in even the state in which he commences to be ill, and to lose the particles of matter which belong to his then body, and least of all in the last stage of weakness, attenuation of frame, and dissolution of bodily beauty to which his malady has reduced him. Nor again, that we should appear in the next world as old men, if dying old with all the infirmities of age, nor with the yet immature limbs and parts of youth if dying young,—nor with the flesh of a child if cut off in infancy.

It shall not be raised in the shape of ugly dust, or filth, nor of corruptible flesh and blood: but a glorious and spiritual body, and a meet companion for a glorified soul. Even now vile as the body is we feel that the soul is loth to part with it. *Bawter, 342.*

We are taught that they shall be so far the same bodies, that every one shall have properly his own, and be truly the same person he was before: but so far different, that those of good persons will be subject to none of the sufferings,

none of the infirmities, none of the necessities of this life. 1 Cor. xv. 42, 4. *Secker.*

What was that body awhile ago? Was it not as unlikely as dust to be what it now is? *Baxter.*

For aught we know of ourselves of our present life and of death; death may immediately, in the natural course of things, put us into a higher and more enlarged state of life, as our birth does; a state in which our capacities and sphere of perception and of action may be much greater than at present. *Butler.*

*Note.*—The glorified body spoken of by S. Paul must be as different from this that we now have as a child's body from that of a grown up person.

We must undergo that change of body which will enable us to live in an altered sphere and condition of being. And notwithstanding this change has taken place, our identity will be perfectly recognisable. The same body, with some difference—a change is given to the quick, and so with the dead. The same body but with the difference of its having received into its corporeity other matter.

*Note.*—Is it not likely that as our SAVIOUR tells us that *there* there is no marrying or giving in marriage, the spiritual body requiring no such institution, so an entirely altered state of things will be found to exist in which neither youth nor growth, nor gradual decay, is any longer necessary, and in which time and the differences it creates will be no more.

952. Q. What in old age shows that the restoration of the same materials, limbs, &c., is not essential to identity?

**A.** Infirmitiess are incompatible with the possession of a glorified body.

**953. Q.** But would not a person's identity be otherwise lost?

**A.** If our aged friends must have of necessity that very same flesh and those very same limbs and wrinkled features with which they left us to preserve their identity and to enable us to recognise them in the next world, we should hardly realise in it the description of a body which sown in weakness shall be raised in glory.

*Note.*—This is not inconsistent with the retention of such marks as would identify without interfering with the perfectness of the body. Such were the holes of our SAVIOUR's side, and in His hands and feet.

**954. Q.** Admitting that for the preservation of identity it were necessary that you should rise with the same stage of development with which you are invested now, and then be stationary, would it appear on consideration that you would sustain any loss?

**A.** I should apparently sustain a loss, for though I should have the moral capacity and the mental endowments of mature age I should never arrive at the wisdom of the aged. And if the child is to remain for ever as an infant cherub or the youth of one dying young to be perpetual, what disparity of bliss would there be between his reward and that of the Christian whose natural bodily powers have become fitted for the abode of the most matured spiritual energies.

955. Q. What view then will adequately comprise the doctrine of the resurrection of "the body" and of "the flesh?"

A. That which is placed before us by S. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. in which he likens the resurrection to the burying of a grain of wheat and its re-appearance upon decay as a more glorious and yet the same body.

956. Q. What other passage of Scripture is well worthy of notice in this stage of the inquiry?

A. "Our substance was not hid from Thee, O LORD, when we were made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth ; Thine eyes did see our substance, yet being imperfect, and in Thy book *were all our members written*, which in *continuance* were fashioned when *as yet there was none of them.*" Ps. cxxxix. 15, 16.

957. Q. What observation is to be made on this?

A. That the whole of man is contained in the embryo, and that He Who fashioned us in the smallest type of being in the womb, and developed the various stages of our bodily capacities in this life, infancy, childhood, youth, manhood, can and no doubt does preserve that type in the decay of the fabric which sprang from it.

Whether they be the identifying parts that the soul shall be reunited to first ; or what or how much of the rest, even the aqueous and the earthly matter which we had from our birth shall be re-assumed, are things past our understanding. *Baxter.* W. C. I. i. 343.

The generation of our flesh is clearly seen by the Father of spirits, the regeneration of the same is known to Him in Whom we live and move and have our being. *Pearson.* Heb. xii. 9; Acts xvii. 28.

958. Q. But is not this making two bodies?

A. Only in the way in which S. Paul has sanctioned the idea, by telling us of a natural and spiritual body, which is the same body only differing under different circumstances.

959. Q. Explain more fully.

A. S. Paul first teaches us that the body which is to be raised hereafter, is in some sense, not the same as that we have now; and he likens it to a seed placed in the ground, which brings forth fruit, first the blade, and then the ear, and then the full corn in the ear,—thus suggesting to us different stages of development of the same things—as unlike, he would show us, as the full ear to the seed first sown.

960. Q. When S. Paul said, "thou fool!" what objection was he answering?

A. The objection that the body perishes and returns to the dust and cannot be all raised in the same atoms again. "Thou fool," he says, "that which thou sowest thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain."

The quick then who will rise at the judgment will pass through a great change as different as the bare grain from the full grown wheat—a terrestrial body from a celestial.

961. Q. Does he not leave us the clue by

which we are to learn that the body that shall be is the very same that it was heretofore ?

*A.* Yes ; he says, “ For that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die.” By which it appears that the mortal body is the same with the immortal ; that which is sown being precisely the same with that which is quickened. But while the same, yet how different in appearance and in state of being.

“ An alteration not of nature, but of condition ; not of their substance, but of their qualities.”  
*Pearson.*

962. *Q.* It would appear then that to constitute an immortal body there must have been the mortal ?

*A.* The mortal body is laid in the grave or “ sown” in faith of the resurrection. Unless there were first the mortal there would be no immortal, which makes the Apostle afterwards say, “ Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterwards that which is spiritual.” From which it follows that the immortal can only be a spiritualised and purified continuation of the mortal.

963. *Q.* With what feelings should the knowledge that our bodies are to rise again possess us ?

*A.* We should treat our bodies with reverence, and shun all sensual habits, running into excess of no kind, but considering them as the abodes of the HOLY GHOST, and as raised from the dead in Baptism by JESUS CHRIST. 2ndly, As having faith in the resurrection of our bodies, and exhi-

biting that faith, we should provide honourably and befittingly for the burial of our friends and relations, according to their station.

964. Q. What general result may we expect from attention to the body?

A. That good habits of whatever kind formed in this life, even skill in various employments may be, for aught we know to the contrary, in some manner brought into use in the next life,—this life being a preparation for the training of the whole man, bodily as well as spiritual functions. The value of the habits of abstinence, endurance, resistance to ease, &c., may be great in another world. And mental and bodily aptitudes may remain, though they may not be called into exercise on the same employments which now occupy and arrest their efforts.

The belief of the resurrection tends to deter from sin, encourage to holiness, comfort in afflictions. How can any man commit a deliberate sin, while he thinks that he must rise and stand before the judgment seat, and give an account and suffer for ever the punishment due to it? What pleasure can entice him for a momentary satisfaction to incur an eternal rejection? How can we defile that body which shall never be raised to glory hereafter, except it have become the temple of the HOLY GHOST? S. Paul's witness, *Acts xxiv. 15, 16*; the proper work of a full persuasion of the resurrection. *1 Cor. xv. 58. Pearson.*

965. Q. What difference do you observe between the resurrection to immortal life and the resurrection which is common to all men?

*A.* The latter is the mere re-union of the soul and body, which go to constitute man's nature ; but the resurrection to immortal life is properly that which is the gift of JESUS CHRIST, and is the result of our incorporation into Him in Holy Baptism, and our continuance in that inheritance which came to us through its covenant.

966. Q. What comfort may the dying or mourners for the dead take in the resurrection ?

*A.* We may be the less amazed when we consider that having our bodies restored, in all probability the next life will not so much differ in the nature of its occupations and interests as in the degrees of its happiness.

967. Q. What is to follow immediately upon the resurrection ?

*A.* The last judgment. S. John v. 25—29.

There shall be a resurrection, that there may be a judgment. *Pearson.*

968. Q. Has not the judgment been the subject of previous catechising ?

*A.* Yes. Questions 570, &c.

969. Q. When will this judgment take place ?

*A.* At the end of the world. S. Matt. xiii. 40, compared with 2 S. Pet. iii. 7. "The heavens and the earth, which are now reserved unto fire *against the day of judgment* and perdition of ungodly men."

970. Q. How is this event further described by S. Peter ?

*A.* "The heavens will pass away with a great noise, and the elements melt with fervent heat ;

the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up." 2 S. Pet. iii. 10.

971. Q. Will the heavens and the earth be then annihilated?

A. No; for with the dissolution of the earth, we are taught by S. Peter to look for, according to the **Lord's** promise, a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. 2 S. Pet. iii. 13. Also S. Luke in Acts iii. 21, speaks of "the times of restitution of all things, until which times the heavens must receive **JESUS CHRIST.**"

972. Q. What mind does S. Peter say we should have in respect to the Advent?

A. "Seeing that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hastening unto the coming of the **SON OF GOD.**" 2 S. Pet. iii. 12.

973. Q. And what conduct does he counsel to us as looking for new heavens and a new earth?

A. "Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of **Him** in peace, without spot and blameless, and account that the long-suffering of the **Lord** is salvation." 2 S. Pet. iii. 14, 15.

974. Q. Unto whom was judgment given?

A. Unto the Son of man. Acts x. 42; xvii. 31; S. John v. 22.

975. Q. What does S. Jude say was the prophecy of Enoch?

A. "Behold the **Lord** cometh with ten thousand of His saints, to execute judgment upon all,

and to convince all that are ungodly, of their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed," &c. S. Jude 14.

976. Q. Does this coming of the **LORD** with His Saints include a lengthened period?

A. It would seem that a lengthened period is meant; for the promise to the Apostles is, that "in the regeneration," which would seem to correspond with that "restitution of all things," until which the heavens must receive **JESUS CHRIST**, "they shall sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of **Israel**," and this promise agrees with S. Jude's prophecy; but the work of judging the twelve tribes seems quite distinct from the final judgment with which that prophecy ends. S. Matt. xix. 28.

977. Q. But are there not prophecies to the effect that **CHRIST** after His second coming is to judge the nations?

A. The Revelation of S. John teaches us that He shall come to reign not merely over the twelve tribes, but over the nations, and that the saints shall be kings and priests of **GOD** and of **CHRIST**, (xx. 4, 6; v. 10.)

978. Q. Does not the process of judgment appear to be, from these passages, one of great length?

A. One not only of great length, but consisting of periods differing in the character of the judicial functions exercised; in the one, the **LORD** being as an arbitrator among the nations, ruling and directing them as the **King** of this earth; in the other, the pronouncer of a final doom upon every

individual born into it from the beginning, according to his deeds.

979. Q. Show this from Scripture.

A. At "the first resurrection," spoken of by S. John in the Revelation xx. 5, (which seems only another expression for "the dead in CHRIST which shall rise first,") it is evident that a thousand years are to elapse.

980. Q. What would appear to be the object of the lapse of a thousand years?

A. That CHRIST may reign over the nations, and bring them to the submission of the Gospel, the judgment here being rather to execute and carry into effect the laws of His kingdom than to pronounce a final sentence.

981. Q. And is it after this that the great day of judgment is to take place?

A. In due course after this is to follow the day of judgment, when "small and great are to stand before GOD, and the books are to be opened, and the dead judged out of those things which were written in the books." Rev. xx. 12, compared with verse 4; S. Matt. xix. 28—30; xx. 23; S. Luke xxii. 28—30.

982. Q. Why is such a lengthened period included under the one idea of CHRIST's Advent?

A. The prophecies evidently contemplate a reign of CHRIST in glory, when He shall have taken to Himself His great power. This whole period is devoted to the development of that reign, the time during which the heavens must receive JESUS CHRIST, the final judgment being the last display of His deputed royalty, after which He is to give

up His reign to GOD, that GOD may be all in all. See Burgh, 264, 5.

983. Q. In Question 572, mention has been made of CHRIST's coming in glory. Show more particularly how this will take place.

A. Acts i. 11. "He will come in like manner as He went into Heaven;" Zechariah says, "that His feet will stand on that day on the Mount of Olives," and "the LORD my GOD shall come, and all the saints with Thee." xiv. 4, 5.

984. Q. Are not the angels to accompany Him?

A. "The angels will come in clouds with Him." 1 Thess. iv. 16; S. Matt. xvi. 27; xiv. 30, 31.

985. Q. Will all or only a part of the redeemed share in this session of the saints in triumphal glory with CHRIST? in other words, will any of the redeemed rise for the first time at the great judgment day?

A. There is a first resurrection, Rev. xx. 5, 6, in which "he that hath part is blessed, and on whom the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of GOD and of CHRIST;" consequently, there must be a second resurrection, when "the rest of the dead" are to live again. These will include besides the still mightier host which have preceded them, all of the dead which have died during the thousand years,—good as well as bad.

986. Q. Will the quick meet the LORD in the air at the first resurrection?

A. Yes. When the dead in CHRIST shall have risen, the quick will meet the LORD in the air. Rev. xx. 4, 5; 2 S. Pet. iii. 10.

"Afterwards they that are CHRIST's at His coming," 1 Cor. xv. 23. This includes as well the righteous quick, as the dead in CHRIST.

"The general opinion of the modern expectants of the LORD's Advent is, that all the redeemed from the beginning shall then rise to reign with CHRIST, while I feel constrained rather to acquiesce in an opinion, known to have been generally held in the early ages of Christianity, that 'the first resurrection,' is not general, even as it respects the saved in this dispensation, but limited to certain from among it, possessing a qualification, &c." *Burgh*, 258, 9.

987. Q. Does it not appear as if the dead in CHRIST which rise first, will have no judgment passed upon them?

A. We cannot say that they too will not be judged at the general assize, but like those already mentioned, (See Q. 916,) Enoch, Moses, Elijah, and those who rose in their bodies at the Crucifixion, they will have reigned with CHRIST beforehand, and judgment will, *in effect*, have passed upon them; although public sentence of CHRIST's justification and reception of them into glory, will have to be bestowed upon them as upon others.

988. Q. What will be the office of these at the judgment?

A. S. Paul teaches us that the saints shall judge the world, and even angels. 1 Cor. vi. 2.

989. Q. What must we consider as the purpose of CHRIST's reign on earth?

A. It would appear to be mainly for the purpose of exhibiting CHRIST's kingdom in triumph and glory. Zech. xiv. 9. See Burgh. 265.

990. *Q.* Is any order of these events prophesied of in the Scriptures?

*A.* S. Paul makes mention of an order, 1 Cor. xv. 23, 24. Every *man* (rather each) in his (its) own order.

*Note.*—This order is summed up briefly:—  
**CHRIST** the First-fruits, afterwards they that are **CHRIST**'s at His coming. Then cometh the end, &c., where we have, 1. The Resurrection of **CHRIST**; 2. His coming; 3. The resurrection of those that are **CHRIST**'s at His coming; 4. The end.

This may be carried out in greater detail by comparing it with 1 Thess. iv. 15—17. First, **CHRIST** descending from heaven. Secondly, the resurrection of the dead in **CHRIST**. 3rdly, those which are alive and remain, i.e. the quick, viz. v. 17, the righteous quick, those who are “to be ever with the **LORD**,” “caught up to meet the **LORD** in the air.” 4thly, (1 Cor. xv. 25.) Then the reign, 2 Thess. i. 10, over the nations. 5thly, to last till all enemies shall be put under His feet, (1 Cor. xv. 25; 2 Thess. i. 7—9.) 6thly, Satan loosed out of his prison (Rev. xx. 7) to deceive the nations. 7thly, the great battle of Gog and Magog. 8thly, the destruction of our **Saviour**'s enemies. 9thly, the judgment of small and great. 10thly, the surrender of **CHRIST**'s kingdom to the **FATHER**, that God may be all in all. (1 Cor. xv. 24—8.)

991. *Q.* Then from what has been said, what would appear as to the place of **CHRIST**'s second Advent?

*A.* That He will again revisit this earth.

“The descriptions also of the millennial period

in passages which undoubtedly refer to it, because decidedly to be fulfilled after the restoration of Israel and coming of CHRIST, represent it, though highly felicitous, yet as terrestrial; that is, the subjects of the kingdom as still in the flesh, with natural distinctions, and other like circumstances still existing. Examples of this are Isa. ii. 4, and xi. 1—10; ix.; and lxv. 18—end; Hos. ii. 18 to end, &c. *Burgh.* 226.

992. Q. With what end would His second coming be to this earth again?

A. That the scene of His humiliation may be the theatre of His glory.

“For the same reason will He reign over the twelve tribes, (S. Matt. xix. 28,) and pour upon them the spirit of grace, that they shall mourn for Him.” Zech. xii. 10.

993. Q. What would be the great object of this second coming to reign?

A. 1. That whereas during the whole period of His Church’s being militant, His religion has been far from universally received, it may yet, at some time, be seen attended with those blessed effects which, under favourable circumstances, and when what lets or hinders its universal diffusion is removed, it is well calculated to produce.

*Note.*—It is but natural to expect that Christianity should have a period for fair trial, and that what the prophecies pledged it to effect should be shown possible to be effected.

“(It is) a first principle, that the dispensations of Providence are not to be judged of by their perversions, but by their genuine tendencies; not by what they do naturally seem to effect, but by

what they would effect if mankind did their part, that part which is justly put and left upon them.”

*Butler, Anal. Pt. ii., c. 1.*

994. *Q.* What consideration would lead us *a priori* to expect a special reward for those who had most devotedly given themselves up to God and to His CHRIST?

*A.* It has been a subject of complaint that God has allowed much suffering to co-exist with the portion of His saints. Doubtless this has been done for a special purpose on His part, viz., to the preparation of many through discipline and suffering for a higher state of excellence and consequent reward. But to take away all objection, a higher reward is apportioned to those who shall suffer for CHRIST’s sake, to the loss of ease, life, goods, &c.

*Note.*—Allusion has already been made to this subject in Note to Q. 986: and we observe that immediately after our SAVIOUR’s promise to His Apostles, that they should in the regeneration sit upon twelve thrones, He declares a special reward, viz., a hundredfold, to every one that hath made sacrifices for His Name’s sake. S. Matt. xix. 29.

“We have here, then, one large exception to the statement, that all the saved reign with CHRIST, and partake of the glory of this ‘first resurrection;’ for the multitude of converts of the millennial period, whom we have just named *subjects* of the kingdom, are excluded. They are not yet ‘made perfect;’ and though saved and redeemed, as being still in the flesh are not glorified. Nor are we unable to assign a

reason for this exclusion, namely, that the converts of the millennial dispensation, walking rather by sight than faith, and having no conflict to sustain with the enemy, who shall then be bound, it is natural that they should yield in glory to the Church militant—those who have lived altogether by faith, who have ‘fought the good fight,’ and having ‘overcome,’ are admitted to ‘sit down with CHRIST in His throne.’—Rev. iii. 21.” *Burgh, on Second Advent, 261.*

995. *Q.* What considerations would lead us *a priori* to expect a kingdom of CHRIST to exist upon earth in which righteousness shall reign?

*A.* It would be natural to expect that angels and men should be privileged to see the ways and designs of GOD, hitherto thwarted, at length brought to a successful issue; and to behold CHRIST as the true LORD of the world, having dethroned the usurper Satan, and not merely individual saints, as now, subject unto CHRIST, but all the then nations of the earth brought to own Him as their King.

996. *Q.* What must be the natural effect produced by the Christian religion under the most favourable circumstances for its development that we can suppose?

*A.* Suppose that from the Christian Church is withdrawn the influence of evil angels, that all political circumstances should combine to assist the nations to bow down to the authority of religion; let the world be blessed with the personal presence of a Divine King as its acknowledged Prince and Ruler, with the holy Confessors and Saints, as His assessors and coadjutors, men of

judgment, tried and full of the deep experience of their own days of probation, to whom all nations shall go to receive laws,—for oracular counsel and guidance;—and what must naturally result, but that those glorious effects should be realised which the prophets speak of?

*Note.*—The existence of such a theocracy would appear to be connected with a return of the Jews to power—and to be carried out through them. Zech. xiv. 4—11; Isa. ii. 2—4.

“And this accordingly the prophecies of that era confirm, which tell us that ‘the kingdom of Israel restored’—the re-establishment of the Jewish nation in their land, under a revived theocracy—shall be the means of blessing all nations with the knowledge of God and of His ways, so making ‘the receiving’ of Israel ‘life from the dead to the Gentiles,’ (Rom. xi. 15.) See Isa. ii. 2, where we find the **LORD’s** house is first established, and then all nations flow into it.” *Burgh*, 227.

997. Q. Is it necessary to suppose that the expression “day of judgment,” means one day of twenty-four hours?

A. Not necessarily. It may mean a lengthened period of time, since “the day of salvation,” is evidently a period which has lasted nearly two thousand years. That day may therefore comprise the duration of **CHRIST’s** reign upon earth in righteousness, together with the final issue of it in the great judgment of all mankind, and the delivery up of the kingdom to the **FATHER**.

998. Q. What are we expressly taught by S. Paul to look for before the coming of the Son of Man, or the Second Advent?

**A.** Before the second coming of CHRIST, we are told that Antichrist must first come. 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4.

999. **Q.** What was the object for which the foundation of this visible kingdom was delayed, and the coming of Antichrist permitted?

**A.** It was to show what the Gospel, under the greatest disadvantages could effect, in maintaining its ground in a wicked world ; and, secondly, To afford opportunity for the Gospel's greatest achievements, in producing through trial and suffering, the high saintly character ; for if even CHRIST Himself were perfected through suffering, much more must the disciple by this means attain perfection.

The object for which the kingdom was delayed and the coming of Antichrist, first in spirit and afterwards in person, was permitted, seems evidently to have been to show what the truth of the Gospel, the knowledge of GOD in CHRIST could effect in overcoming the world ; and to exhibit the glorious and interesting spectacle of the believer, surrounded with the body of sin and death, entering the lists with all the allurements, and all the opposition of the world, and all the devices of the adversary, and yet proving victorious through CHRIST Who strengtheneth him.

Such victory did CHRIST design should be achieved by His followers during this season of His absence ; such conformity to His sufferings and death, that when the time should come for Him "to take His great power and reign," they might reign with Him, and with such high vocation is the Church of this dispensation called. *Burgh*, on Second Advent, 223.

1000. *Q.* What will be an important end of the final day, in addition to the direct object of judgment?

*A.* The judging of the secrets of men by JESUS CHRIST. Rom. ii. 16.

"But there are two uses of that day; the former, not properly judicial, but to give an account of the justice of Providence in all its past dispensations, by bringing every secret thing to light. That use of a general appearance is intimated in the revelations of the Old Testament, (Eccles. xii. 14,) for discovering the secret virtues that had been rewarded in the prosperity of sinners, and the unknown wickednesses, which had been punished by the perpetual infelicities of better deserving persons, and the many unknown ways of GOD for adjusting those seeming incongruities to the persons respectively concerned in them." *Dodwell, on the Soul*, 145.

1001. *Q.* What does the declaration of S. Peter concerning the new heavens and the new earth, lead us to conclude?

*A.* That our final redemption will be secured in a world created out of the ruins of the present earth.

I am indeed fully assured that "the new heavens and earth," and not heaven is the inheritance of the redeemed. I believe also that out of the materials of this present world dissolved by fire—taken as it were to pieces, that they may be built up again—shall arise that new creation, fashioned to suit the new and glorified existence of the whole body of the saved, raised or changed, by whom it shall be inhabited for ever. But is this a descrip-

tion of the millennial state of the earth during the reign of CHRIST? No; for we have seen that the inhabitants of the earth at that time are men in flesh, "the nations who go up (to Jerusalem) from year to year, to worship the King, the LORD of Hosts," &c. *Burgh's Lect. on Second Advent*, 259, 260.

"The common imagination that we have of paradise on the other side of death, is that of a lofty aerial region, where the inmates float in ether, or are mysteriously suspended upon nothing—where all the warm and sensible accompaniments, which give such an expression of strength, and life, and colouring to our present habitation, are attenuated into a sort of spiritual element, that is meagre and imperceptible and utterly uninviting to the eye of mortals here below—where every vestige of materialism is done away, and nothing left but certain unearthly scenes that have no power of allurement, and certain unearthly ecstasies, with which it is felt impossible to sympathise. The holders of this imagination forget all the while, that really there is no essential connexion between materialism and sin; that the world which we now inhabit, had all the amplitude and solidity of its present materialism before sin entered into it; that God so far on that account from looking slightly upon it, 'saw everything that He had made, and behold it was all very good.' They forget that on the birth of materialism, 'the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy.' No, my brethren, the object of the administration we sit under, is to extirpate sin, but it is not to sweep away materialism. By the convulsions of the last day, it may be shaken, and broken down from its present arrangements, and

thrown into such fitful agitations, as that the whole of its existing framework shall fall to pieces, and with a heat so fervent as to melt its most solid elements, may it be utterly dissolved. And thus may the earth again become without form and void, but without one particle of its substance going into annihilation. Out of the ruins of this second chaos, may another heaven and another earth be made to arise, and a vast materialism, with other aspects of magnificence and beauty, emerge from the wreck of this mighty transformation, and the world be peopled as before, with the varieties of material loveliness, and space be again lighted up into a firmament of natural splendour." *Chalmers' Astronomical Discourses.* 283—5.

1002. *Q.* What is the life between the grave and the resurrection?

*A.* That life consists in the happiness which is conferred on the soul, departed in the fear and admitted to the Presence of God. (Phil. i. 23; 2 Cor. v. 8.)

1003. *Q.* And what is the belief concerning the wicked?

*A.* The souls of evil men were believed to be capable of misery, immediately upon their separation from their bodies. But neither the happiness of the good, nor the misery of the evil, was imagined to be then so great, as it shall be after the resurrection.

1004. *Q.* Is it to be supposed that the next world is a state of rest entirely, and that there is now no longer any active service of God?

*A.* Far from it: even in the separate state of

souls, and before the union of body and soul, we must expect to be actively engaged. A learned prelate of our Church has observed "Solomon does not mean that departed souls have no knowledge or sense of anything; as if the next world were an idle or inactive state, where we shall know nothing and have nothing to do, but only that death puts an end to the working for another world." *Bishop Greene's Four Last Things.*

1005. Q. Have not some asserted, that the soul immediately after death, and during its separate state before the resurrection, has no perception at all either of joy or of sorrow, in fact, is in a state of lethargy?

A. Yes; but how can the soul subsist, and remain a soul, without sense and perception; since perception must be an essential property of the soul?

*Note.*—Sleep applied to the soul, is altogether irreconcilable with many texts of Scripture. So our SAVIOUR's description of the rich man and Lazarus, which if even taken as a parable, must be allowed to be a correct representation of the state of souls after death. 2ndly, It is by our SAVIOUR called Paradise, (S. Luke xxiii. 43,) an odd expression for a place of oblivion. 3rdly, S. Paul was caught up, not only into heaven, but into Paradise likewise; which was so far from being a place of darkness and obscurity, silence and oblivion, where its inhabitants are all in a profound sleep; that, on the contrary, it is a most glorious place of life and glory, where he himself heard "unspeakable words," (2 Cor. xii. 4,) and hence he tells the Philippians, "that he

desired to depart and be with CHRIST which was far better ;" but how could he think it to be so much better to depart from the body, than to remain in it, if upon his departure, he was to be deprived of all sense, and sink into a lethargy, or go into " a land where all things are forgotten." So also 2 Cor. v. 6, 8.

1006. Q. When it is said that there is no work nor device in the grave, what is intended to be implied ?

A. That we can no longer use any devices or follow any methods, by which we can change our lot in the next world, which must be either for heaven or hell.

1007. Q. How is mention made of this doctrine in the ancient liturgies ?

A. In the ancient liturgies, the place and receptacle of the spirits of just men deceased, is usually styled the "region of the living ; the region of the godly ; and the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and of all those that have pleased GOD, and obeyed His will, from the beginning of the world."

### *Art. XII. The Life Everlasting.*

1008. Q. What takes place upon the judgment ?

A. The execution of the sentence, "The wicked shall go into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life everlasting." (S. Matt. xxv. 46.) There is to be a resurrection of the dead both of the just and the unjust. Acts xxiv. 14, 15. A resurrection of life, and a resurrection of damnation. S. John v. 29.

1009. Q. How does the Athanasian Creed express this?

A. "They that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire."

1010. Q. What is the extent of this resurrection?

A. It extends to all men. Whoever dies is counted either among the just or the unjust, (S. John v. 29; S. Matt. xxv. 32, 46.) And all must stand before the judgment-seat of CHRIST. (1 Cor. xv. 22; Rom. xiv. 10; 2 Cor. v. 10.)

*Note.*—This sharply drawn line of division, has been much complained of, and it has been asserted that the degrees of goodness must necessarily descend towards those who are condemned for evil in the nicest shades, until the absence of good becomes blended with the first beginnings of moral evil; so that the lowest of the good should not deserve the rewards of heaven, nor the best among the evil merit the condemnation of hell. But great must be the moral abyss between that man who has the will and moral power to turn to God and embrace, like the dying thief on the cross, His loving offers, and the man who, though the best, in a moral point of view, among the evil, has no heart for God, and is an enemy to His CHRIST, having given himself up to despair, as being entirely without the instincts of the Gospel.

Bishop Greene says, Though the punishment of all ungodly men in the next world, will undoubtedly be very severe, yet we have the greatest reason to believe, that the punishment of some wicked men there shall be far more severe than that of others. Our SAVIOUR tells us, that ac-

eording to the degree of light and knowledge, which had been afforded to men in this world, shall be the degree of their torment in the next. S. Luke xii. 47. And in general we are told, that the punishment of sinners shall receive its aggrava-tion from the advantages and opportunities which men have neglected or abused in their lives, v. 48. So likewise Heb. ii. 2, 3. God will punish the contempt of the Gospel more severely than that of the law of Moses. So also Heb. x. 28, 29.

Moreover, we cannot but conclude that thus it will be, both from the consideration of the Divine justice, and also from the nature of the thing. From the former, we may be well assured that GOD, Who is privy to all the thoughts and actions of every man, though committed with never so much secrecy, and who perfectly knows how to distinguish between different degrees of wickedness, and is likewise abundantly able to punish every sinner according to his desert, will in the future state proportion the torment according to every man's guilt, and inflict such punishment on every sinner as his particular offences shall deserve.

And in the nature of the thing, it cannot well be otherwise, even though the Divine justice should not interpose. For where the greatest guilt is, there will of necessity be the greatest remorse, and so the greatest vexation and punishment from the sense of it. *Bishop Greene's Four Last Things*, 169.

1011. *Q.* Were even the heathen affected with the conviction of a judgment to come?

*A.* Acts xxiv. 25.

1012. *Q.* By what power will this resurrection to eternal existence be effected?

**A.** By CHRIST's, (1 Cor. xv. 22.) As in Adam all die, so in CHRIST shall all be made alive. CHRIST is to destroy death, but if anyone should be left still dead, death were not destroyed.

*Pearson.*

1013. **Q.** Did not the Jews understand the resurrection with some limitation?

**A.** In Daniel two different sorts of persons rising are mentioned, yet with limitation, (Dan. xii. 2.) *Many* of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; therefore, they said, it is not written, "All shall awake."

*Note.*—This passage, xii. 1—3, evidently refers to CHRIST's coming to reign temporally, before which "the time of trouble," and the delivery of Daniel's people is to take place. Hence, "many" is used with respect to the dead in CHRIST, of the first Resurrection, which are, at that special time, to rise and with the quick "to meet the LORD in the air," and afterwards are to reign with Him.

1014. **Q.** Is not life everlasting the reward of those who die in CHRIST?

**A.** Yes, expressly so. (S. John v. 4.)

That life which alone deserves to be so called, and which GOD has prepared for the faithful in His kingdom, is the singular privilege of CHRIST's Church. *Wake.*

*Note.*—If the resurrection to everlasting life, and the resurrection of the unjust, be equally through JESUS CHRIST, it becomes a question how both the Jews of the Old Testament, and the Patriarchs before them, are to be included among the saved, and still further, how the more pious

and moral among the Gentiles, have obtained, or are to obtain salvation.

On the one hand, we have these principles to guide us. A man is judged by what he has received, and not by what he has not. 2 Cor. viii. 12. And again, the Gentiles which have not the law, and do by nature the things contained in the law, are a law unto themselves, &c. Rom. ii. 14, 15.

On the other hand, as the resurrection is by JESUS CHRIST, and "as no man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth," Art. xviii., but only by the merits of the SAVIOUR, the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST must have a retrospective action upon both Jew and Gentile. When S. Paul speaks, (1 Cor. x. 1—4,) of the Jews who "were all baptised unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink, for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was CHRIST;" it is obvious, that a way of salvation was provided for the people of GOD before CHRIST's coming; and whereas, with the Jews, those who did not live up to the law would be judged by the law; with the Gentile also is judgment, "for as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law, there being no respect of persons with GOD." Rom. ii. 11, 12.

And here the expressions in the past tense "as many as have sinned without law," and "as many as have sinned in the law," embrace clearly both Jews and Gentiles, before our SAVIOUR's coming. And this being the case, we have now only to consider how by CHRIST's power, these shall "all be made alive." The children of His kingdom are by admission therein made alive, and through the Spirit their resurrection to eternal life is wrought. What gives the power of the re-

surrection to the Jew deceased before CHRIST, who had some relation to His Gospel, and what more especially to the Gentile who had none? It seems to be implied by the terms of the Gospel, that none can be received to its privileges, without declaring their faith in Him, and without receiving from Him the gift of the Spirit. Now it is evident that the departed souls of Jews and Gentiles, could only receive the Gospel at the time of CHRIST's descent into hell. And that CHRIST did actually preach to them on His descent into hell, was the general view of the primitive ages of Christianity, and was the doctrine of one of the first of the original Forty-two Articles. Bishop Pearson indeed interprets this of Noah's preaching, but evidently upon a forced construction. Bishop Horsley understands it literally of a preaching to the souls in prison, communicating the glad tidings of salvation to them. Nor are there wanting remarkable texts of Scripture confirming this doctrine. Such are; "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." This might relate alone to the resurrection, the subject of vv. 28 and 29, did the words "now is," agree with that view. The "now is," is the now of the time of our SAVIOUR's then circumstances, not of the resurrection which was to be future. Again, the hearing here is voluntary, in the 28th it is compulsory. Again, S. Peter iv. 6, "For this cause the Gospel was preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the Spirit." For a full view of this interesting and important subject, see *Dodwell on the Soul*, Sections 38—44.

1015. *Q.* How then are the wicked thus raised to an everlasting existence, as well as the righteous?

*A.* To an existence of misery but not of life, since life is properly ascribed to a state of happiness, but the wicked are raised to an everlasting duration of misery, a state of endless dying. (S. Matt. x. 28; xxv. 41, 46; xviii. 8; S. Mark ix. 44—47.)

“We call that life eternal, in which there is happiness without end. For if the soul is undergoing the punishment, with which the unclean spirits themselves are tormented, that is rather death than life eternal. There is, indeed, no greater and worse death than when death is never dying.” S. Aug. *de Civit. Dei*, vi. cap. 12.

1016. *Q.* But how can a just and merciful GOD punish with infinite suffering the finite and transient sins of man?

*A.* It might be said without compromising GOD's attribute of mercy, that, to further His objects with man, He has committed a capacity for immortality to him with the Gospel, and while one set of His creatures have preserved the gift to eternal happiness—the other have abused it to eternal misery. Though the reward equally with the punishment may follow as a natural result of the obedience or infringement of Divine laws, yet they are justly claimed as GOD's rewards and punishments. That they are eternal results of transient causes is not to be ascribed to GOD as any defect.

*Note.*—We may consider whether we intend to use the word “punish,” as meaning to inflict suffering by an active or arbitrary decree, or God’s allowing His own laws to take effect. For if the latter stands good—pre-supposing the gift of the endless existence of all souls and bodies upon the basis of a trial in the long run fair to all alike—the eternal duration of misery and suffering may take place as a punishment to both body and soul, in the nature of things, impossible even by God, to be averted; and this without any active interposition on His part, and merely by the execution of His own, or as we term them, natural laws.

An able living preacher says, “ Both the joys of heaven and the miseries of hell, arise from the stereotyping of those characters hereafter, which men formed for themselves here, ‘ He that is unjust, is to be unjust still;’ he ‘ which is filthy, to be filthy still;’ he ‘ that is righteous, to be righteous still;’ he ‘ that is holy, to be holy still.’ I do not think that we are to infer that they are to be thus after they depart hence, if thus they depart, because the ‘ **LORD** the righteous Judge,’ hath decreed that so they shall be, but because in the nature of things they cannot be otherwise.”

“ Till we get rid of the notion that the rewards and punishments of the future world, are arbitrary privileges or inflictions, so far as God is concerned, which may or may not bear a correspondence to the moral condition of such as receive or endure them, we shall never realise the intimate relation of this world to that, as we should, or the necessary influence of our conduct here, upon our weal or woe there.” *Dr. A. B. Evans, Sermon on Hell.*

"I have argued upon the principles of the fatalists, which I do not believe, and have omitted a thing of the utmost importance, which I do believe,—the moral fitness and unfitness of actions, prior to all will whatever, which I apprehend as certainly to determine the Divine conduct, as speculative truth and falsehood necessarily determine the Divine judgment." *Butler's Analogy*, Part 2, c. 1.

1017. Q. Are we to suppose that positive punishments are inflicted by God, over and above those which are brought upon mankind as arising out of their own errors and sins?

A. It is certain that the Scriptures promise, as well rewards as punishments, additional to those which are inherent in men's characters, and the natural consequences of their actions. The parable of the talents amply shows this—extraneous rewards being bestowed by God—although doubtless in correspondence with the capacity of the recipient for enjoying them.

*Note.*—If in this world, in which we now live and breathe, men were only punished according to their deserts in a moral point of view, we could the more readily admit the exclusive working of such a principle in the next. But we see that, in effect, men are often punished, beyond the natural consequence of their faults, by incidental but inevitable evils arising in connection with the situation in which their first sins, or faults, or ill-judged conduct have thrown them. And we have no reason to conclude that the principles of action will be different in the next life; but indeed since in this world we know that God does

interfere frequently to restore the sinner to better ways, but have no indication of any such favour in the next; we have every ground to fear that those principles will have a more full and unchecked liberty of operation. One point, it is plain, here deserves the most serious attention, viz., that our Blessed LORD represents Himself, when coming to His kingdom, as rewarding His servants with rewards far exceeding the results obtained by their several exertions, and gives to the one who receives most when thus rewarded, still more, even the original donation which had by his fellow servant been unprofitably neglected. And to those expostulating with Him that he had already the fullest gift, He lays down the principle that "unto every one that hath shall be given; and from him that hath not, *even that he hath* shall be taken away from him."

1018. Q. Do we then well to say, that God would not be merciful if He were actively to condemn or consign to a sure punishment the wicked?

A. GOD has certainly represented Himself as active in condemnation and punishment of wickedness, and it seems strange to say that this is contrary to His attribute of mercy.

*Note.*—If the punishment is moral, arising naturally out of the sins of men, the judgment upon this must be just, and cannot be unmerciful. The fact is, that with God, diversely from human judges, all judicial proceedings must be in complete harmony with, as the most perfect justice, so also the most perfect mercy.

1019. Q. Must we understand the place of condemnation to be local, and the punishment material?

**A.** Even supposing that the Scripture declarations of God's wrath taking effect in penal fires, are only a manner of speaking accommodated to human perceptions, it may be feared that they amount to the same or even worse sufferings in the event. It would only be right that God, for the happiness of the just, should separate from them the wicked, when that necessity of probation and trial is past, which is now so calculated to improve them ;—an act of the purest necessity, which the most rationalistic mind cannot object to as unnecessary and unjust, but that rather it would be unjust if it were otherwise—but this separation is condemnation, and must be local, and no punishment of a hell of material torments can well be greater ; and still further, perhaps it amounts, in the nature of things, to material torments, for we cannot say what may be the character of the place of banishment, to which such beings *must* be consigned.

1020. Q. Would the local separation of the wicked from the good—the condemnation of the wicked to the society of those wicked as themselves or more so—be thought sufficient to render justice to the words of Scripture representing God as taking vengeance in material punishments of fire ?

**A.** Certainly the passions of the wicked will serve to render any place to which they may be consigned (even if naturally beautiful,) an abode of moral misery, the intensity and depth of which it is impossible to realise. In this life we can have no conception of the blackness and horror of that wickedness which is unalleviated with the

mitigation of any accompanying goodness or redeeming circumstances, and certainly there is no great stretch of the imagination in conceiving that in the world separated to evil spirits, there must be contentions and murderous strife among private individuals, and that even wars, with blood, and fire, and smoking carnage must be frequent.

“Whatever doubt we may be in about the local situation of it, yet this we may be sure of, that those descriptions of the dreadful miseries and torments of it, which are given us in the Holy Scripture, shall all be found to have something fully answering to them; (though not perhaps in the very letter of them) by all those wretched creatures, who shall, by the just judgment of God, be doomed to endure them.” *Bishop Greene*, 155.

The punishments are sometimes expressed by “wrath,” (S. John iii. 36; S. Matt. iii. 7; 1 Thess. i. 10; Rom. ix. 22; 1 Thess. v. 9.) And those punishments are called “wrath,” because they are the effects of God’s wrath. And the horror of the place where they are undergone, is set forth by “outer darkness, where there is weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth.” S. Matt. xxii. 13. In other places, the punishment is expressed by “fire,” S. Matt. xiii. 50; Rev. xix. 20; “smoke,” xiv. 11; blackness and darkness, S. Jude 13; everlasting fire, S. Matt. xxv. 41; S. Mark ix. 43. Some may say that these cannot be true in a literal sense; now suppose it were so, yet if they do at all believe these threatenings, they must likewise believe, that some terrible thing is signified by everlasting burnings, and if fire and brimstone serve only for metaphor to describe these torments by, what will the real sufferings of the damned be? For the Spirit of God does not

use to describe things by such metaphors as are greater than the things themselves. *Bishop Greene.*

*Note.*—Consider what description is given of certain kinds of hells on earth. Convict hulks and prisons, Norfolk Island with its line of bulldogs across it to prevent escape, and sharks in the bays; all hope shut out of altering one's condition; the impossibility of being good, when goodness is resented as a crime, and wickedness is gratuitous; consider the superfluity of naughtiness, the rejoicing in iniquity; its communicativeness, because without let or hindrance, and its consequent issue in the blackness of despair; contemplate the hopeless senselessness of follies; the blasphemies, which are detested, but which must be repeated; even the corporal pain inflicted by such children of hell upon their companions in their grim sports, or in their revengeful malice.

In Christopher Marlowe's *Faustus*, Mephistopheles is represented as carrying hell about him.

"*Faust.* Where are you damned ?

*Meph.* In hell.

*Faust.* How comes it then that thou art out of hell ?

*Meph.* Why, this is hell, nor am I out of it !

Think'st thou that I who saw the face of God,  
And tasted the eternal joys of heaven,  
Am not tormented with ten thousand hells,  
In being deprived of everlasting bliss ?"

And Milton makes Satan say in sight of Paradise,

" Me miserable ! which way shall I fly  
Infinite wrath and infinite despair ?  
Which way I fly is hell ! myself am hell !"

The contrast greatly heightened by consideration of the joys and felicity of the just—who enjoy

the presence of GOD and of CHRIST.—This noticed by our LORD, S. Luke xiii. 28. Many wise and good men have thought the punishment of loss greater than that of sense. If even the wicked man could be admitted to heavenly joys, then there would be nothing but double misery for him—impure where all is pure—having no part in a felicity which he sees but cannot share.

Again, from the dominion of long-contracted habits, the spirit itself may be tormented with ungratified but constantly recurring wishes, an unappeasable thirst for unattainable things, while the body may be no less preyed upon by inextinguishable lusts and passions.

1019. Q. But might not God in His mercy, relieve the wicked from their most miserable plight, by allowing them to fall into annihilation ?

A. God having offered eternal life on the one hand, and threatened eternal misery on the other, the one as the encouragement of obedience, the other as the punishment of disobedience ; how could the execution of a threat so held out, consistently with God's unfailing truth, (for shall God be the author of a lie ?) be foregone ?

*Note.*—As respects the probability of annihilation, Milton thought it rational to make the fallen spirit thus reason :

“ Sad cure ! for *who would lose*,  
Though full of pain, the intellectual being,  
Those thoughts that wander through eternity,  
To perish rather, swallowed up and lost  
In the wide womb of uncreated night,  
Devoid of sense and motion ? And who knows

Let this be good, whether our angry foe  
Can give it or will ever? *how He can*  
Is doubtful, that He never will is sure.  
Will He so wise, let loose at once His ire,  
Belike through impotence, or unaware,  
To give His enemies their wish, and end  
Them in His anger, whom His anger saves  
To punish endless."

1020. *Q.* But to turn to Scripture; having so far cleared the way, let us inquire whether it is true, that the passages which speak of everlasting death and punishment, may be understood as meaning annihilation.

*A.* S. Matt. xxv. 41, 46. Lest any should imagine that the fire shall be eternal but the torments not, it followeth "these shall go away into everlasting punishment." If the fire be everlasting by which GOD punisheth the reprobates, if the punishment inflicted be also everlasting, then must the reprobates everlastingly subsist to endure that punishment, otherwise there would be a punishment inflicted, and none endured, which is a contradiction. *Pearson.*

The eternity of that fire prepared for the devil and his angels, (S. Matt. xxv. 41,) is a sufficient demonstration of the eternity of such as suffer in it, and the question only can be what that eternity doth signify. For, because some things are called in the Scriptures eternal, which have a limited duration, therefore, some may imagine the fire of hell to be in that sense eternal, as lasting to the time appointed by GOD for the duration of it. But as the fire is termed eternal, so that eternity is described as absolute.

The end of the burning by fire is by extinguishing, and that which cannot be extinguished can never end ; but such is the fire which shall torment the reprobate, for He, Whose fan is in His hand, shall burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire ; (S. Matt. iii. 12,) and hath taught us, that it is better to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire, to go into hell, into the fire that "never shall be quenched ;" hath further yet explained Himself by that undeniably description of the place of torments, "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," S. Mark ix. 43—46. And that we may yet further be assured that this fire shall never be extinguished, we read that the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever, (Rev. xiv. 11,) and that those which are cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever ; which expression compare with Rev. iv. 8 ; vii. 15, "They rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy ;" "They serve Him day and night in His temple." If, then, the fire in which the reprobates are to be tormented be everlasting, if so absolutely everlasting that it shall never be quenched, if so certainly never to be quenched, that the smoke thereof shall ascend for ever and ever, if those which are cast into it shall be tormented for ever and ever, (all which the Scriptures expressly teach,) then shall the wicked never be so consumed as to be annihilated. *Pearson.*

Eternal punishment is certainly not eternal annihilation. "One may as well say, that a malefactor, who was executed for his crimes a hundred years ago, still continues to be punished by the magistrate ; as that after a man should be

once annihilated, he should continue to be punished for his sins by God." *Wake.*

1021. Q. But why should God put man into a risk of losing eternal happiness, and at the same time of living a life of eternal pain and misery?

A. It is only in accordance with what we find already as an established principle in the world, viz., that men are subject for certain appreciable objects to the trials and temptations of this life with risk of their temporal happiness; that while to some probation is profitable, to many it happens that they succumb under trial, and that their sins and follies, in their consequences, follow them to the next world; that for them, in effect, no place of repentance is found. On the other hand, had they resisted the temptation to evil, the advantage of strength and spiritual power would have been acquired and all consequent rewards. If then, it is contended, that there is injustice in this; it must be admitted that it has been begun in this life, and its fruition of evil is only naturally realised in the next. That the punishment is eternal makes no difference—if the course which has led to it has been plainly self-chosen—and if the opportunity for higher results has been afforded but has not been embraced.

*Note.*—It may be said, you do not know that your way of regarding these points is the true one. And we confess, that we cannot confidently declare that our rationale or way of explaining the difficulties involved in these Articles of the Faith, is anything but a probable interpretation; but this opens up precisely the position we aim at

maintaining throughout these attempted explanations. All that we profess truly to know, is the truth of the Articles themselves, as propounded and expanded more fully in the Scriptures by the Church; but as reasons have been alleged for impugning them, or explaining away the obvious meaning of the words in which they are couched; it may be shown, that reasons as or more forcible may be exhibited on the opposite side; and that, therefore, so long as this can be done, no ground exists for either refusing our faith in them, as contradictory to reason, or for explaining away the great and highly concerning truths they evidently were intended to convey.

1022. Q. What are the other arguments against considering *everlasting* punishment as likely to come to an end?

A. S. Matt. xxv. 46. These shall go away into everlasting (*aiώνιον*) punishment, but the righteous into life eternal, (*aiώνιον*). “The life eternal may as well be affirmed to have an end as the everlasting punishment, because they are both delivered in the same expression.” *Pearson.*

“If at any time the punishments of the wicked are to be ended, at some time consequently must be ended also the felicities of the happy. These will go into punishment everlasting, but the just into life eternal. If, therefore, this is not true which is threatened, neither is that true which He has promised.” *S. Greg. Morals, Bk. xxxiv. C. 19.*

Rev. xiv. 11, “the smoke of their torment ascendeth.” It is said, that it ascends for ever and ever, (*εἰς αἰώνα δὲ αἰώνων*,) that we may learn that the punishment of sinners is without end,

just as also the delight of the just is eternal. Andreas Cæsar, ad locum. Just as the unspeakable gain of the just is eternal, (*aiώνιον*) so also the punishment of sinners is both endless and irresistible (*ἀντίδοταν*.) So Germ. Patr. of Constantinople, in his defence of Greg. Nyss. *Pearson*, Notes to p. 665.

1023. *Q.* What are the Scriptural declarations, that life in the next world is to be everlasting?

*A.* Eternal life; continuing city; house eternal in the heavens; eternal glory; an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, that fadeth not away. (S. Luke xvi. 9; Heb. v. 9; ix. 15; xiii. 14; 1 S. Pet. v. 10; i. 4; 2 S. Pet. i. 11; 2 Cor. v. 1.)

1024. *Q.* What terms are liable to no mistake?

*A.* S. John viii. 51; xi. 26; 2 Tim. i. 10; Rev. xxi. 4. Where is life and no death, there must be everlasting life. *Barrow.*

*Note.*—There is a death which is in these passages promised to the wicked, but which the righteous escape. This is not of course physical death, the mere dissolution of soul and body, but a death in contradistinction to life and immortality, (2 Tim. i. 10,) in effect, the second death. See Question 1027.

1025. *Q.* As the word translated eternal (*aiώνιος*) is often used in the Scriptures in conjunction with events which have an end, is it not natural to suppose that hell torments will be but of limited duration?

*A.* It is true that in several places of Scripture, (*aiώνιος*), eternal—for ever—for ever and ever—are used of events which have come to an end, or

are to have an end ; (Rom. xvi. 25 ; Isa. xxxiv. 9, 10;) but it must be remembered that they are also used in connection with beings or things that are not to have an end, as God, the happiness of heaven, &c., Rom. xvi. 26. In the one set of instances, they express duration as lasting as the nature of the things of which they speak, as the kingdom of Judah—the throne of David—the laws of the Medes and Persians—the salutation, O king, live for ever!—but in the other set limit is not meant, because the nature of the subject does not admit of it.

It is remarked in Rose's Parkhurst, on the word *άεινος*, that "Schleusner without hesitation (and this deserves remark) gives to the word, in all passages referring to the future lot of the wicked and the good, the sense of without end."

*Aἰών* in the LXX. denotes *time hidden from man, whether definite or indefinite, whether past or future.* Rose's Parkhurst.

1026. Q. Exception is made to material punishment, as though the ALMIGHTY would not from His merciful character, prepare, in addition to miseries self-induced, the super-added torments of fire and brimstone for any creature made by Him. What is to be said to this?

A. 1st, Scripture it has been seen, speaks plainly to *the fact* of material pains, although, it may be, that fire and brimstone are used figuratively for punishments yet more dreadful, but not the less material. How, indeed, those passages are to be disposed of, which make GOD "a consuming fire," and JESUS CHRIST and His Angels, the source of

His flaming vengeance against those who “obey not the Gospel,” it is difficult to explain.

“The fire of hell is described as being of celestial original; not as breaking out from the centre of the world itself, and its subterraneous volcanoes, as philosophers have fancied. So, the LORD JESUS shall be revealed from heaven, with His mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not GOD, and that obey not the Gospel of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, 2 Thess. i. 7, 8. Therefore GOD Himself is so often called a consuming fire, Deut. iv. 24; ix. 3; Heb. xii. 29, in regard of the Shechinah, which has the nature of fire as well as of light. So He is described, a fire shall devour before Him, Ps. l. 3. This is that which so affrighted the Jews in the delivery of the law, and which makes it impossible to see His face and live, and seems to be alluded to by the poets, when Semele is said to have been burnt by Jupiter, appearing to her in his native glory. Therefore, His angels, the satellites of His appearing presence, are said to be a flaming fire, Heb. i. 7; Ps. civ. 4, and this fire therefore of the majestic presence, is by all represented as eternal, and as the original of that which shall destroy the world, and continue the punishment of those who were adjudged to it, to all eternity.” *Dodwell on the Soul*, 153, 4.

2nd, That GOD does really condemn actively, pronouncing judgment which is something additional to the natural workings of things by consequence, and not interfering to prevent the contingencies and accidents of evil companionship to take effect.

3rd, And in the assignment of a different locality for the wicked from the just, which is in

itself material punishment, as the assignment of the just to heavenly mansions is a material reward.

1027. Q. But is it not said that the wicked after the resurrection shall be punished with death, and that "a second death;" and so they shall be no more, nor can, in any sense, be said to live or subsist?

A. As it is said, (Rev. ii. 11,) "He that overcometh shall not be hurt (*οὐ μὴ ἀδικηθῆ*, see S. Luke x. 19,) by the second death;" it seems that they which die that death shall be hurt by it; whereas, if it were annihilation, and so a conclusion of their torments, it would be no way hurtful or injurious, but highly beneficial to them. But the living torments are the second death. For death and hell were cast into the lake of fire; this is the second death. Rev. xx. 14, 15. *Pearson.*

*Note.*—See also the power of the second death, asserted in another passage, "But the fearful, and unbelieving, the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." Rev. xxi. 8. How these wretched beings are to be understood as having *their part* in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, and yet to be all the while annihilate, who is able to understand?

1028. Q. Did not this notion of a second death exist before our SAVIOUR's time?

A. In the Chaldee paraphrase is found, "Let Reuben live in the life of the world, and not die the second death," from which and the like places,

(See *Pearson, Notes*) it appears that the Jews believed that the wicked after death, shall be delivered to a second death ; that this death should be in the world to come ; that they should by this death be punished for their sins.

*Note.*—Some say that “second death,” can only mean physical death, whereas death is continually used in Scripture in unmistakeable reference to a dying, which is enduring, as “we know that we have passed from death unto life. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death.” 1 S. John iii. 14. See also S. John v. 24.

When GOD promised death to our first parents on their eating the forbidden fruit, it was evidently not physical death only that was threatened ; or, that very day in which they ate of it they would have surely died by a separation of the soul and body, but it was a much more serious evil, of which physical death was only one of the consequences—the death everlasting which is opposed to life everlasting.

1029. *Q.* What is to be said to the assertion that threats of material punishment are not attended with any great effect?

*A.* 1st, Butler speaks of fears of future punishment, and peaceful hopes of a better life in those who fully believe ; and says, that these hopes and fears are present uneasiness and satisfaction to the mind, and cannot be got rid of by great part of the world. And no one can say, how considerable this uneasiness and satisfaction may be, or what upon the whole it may amount to. Anal. Pt. I. c. 3. *Butler's Works*, V. 2, p. 64.

2ndly, They are set forth in Scripture, and if

some deny their literal sense, it must yet be admitted they are there with an object, and that at the least with a view of creating an effect on the hearts of men, in deterring them from sin. Even if material torments were to be interpreted into spiritual misery, still the Scriptural way of expression would be preferably to be continued in use because chosen by God.

*Note.*—Supposing it is entirely, as we are informed, that God only afflicts the wicked with loss, but with no active increase of vindictive wrath; yet since this latter method of expression has been adopted, it is impossible to doubt, but that it is absolutely necessary to be used as only an adequate means of conveying to the general mind impressions of God's opposition to sin and sinners.

Indeed, it may be doubted whether any deviation from the Scriptural phraseology in ordinary teaching on these subjects, may not be a neglect of the precept to speak as the oracles of God.

1030. *Q.* But do not the words *perdition*, *destruction*, (*σλλυματ*, *pereo*) indicate annihilation?

*A.* He that says he is undone, does not mean that he shall be no more. Besides, everlasting destruction signifies perpetual suffering. (2 Thess. i. 8, 9.) *Pearson.*

Though the word "perish," may bear the milder sense of only ceasing to be, yet it is also used in the Scriptures, concerning them whom all must believe liable to the severest positive inflictions. Judas himself is called *νιδος ἀνωλαέιας*, (S. John xvii. 12.) Yet of this case our SAVIOUR Himself assures us, that it had been good for him

if he had not been born, S. Matt. xxvi. 24, which could not have been true, if his punishment had been no more than a discontinuance of that being received at his birth. *Dodwell, on the Soul*, 143.

1031. *Q.* What reflections show that there can be no hope for the sinner who has died in his sins?

*A.* The favour of God is not to be obtained when there is no means left to obtain it; but in the world to come there is no place for faith, nor virtue in repentance.

*Note.*—Supposing even that the parable of Lazarus and Dives does not represent a series of facts, but is a mere parable; yet it must mean to teach Divine truths under its representations, and the impassable gulf between Dives and Lazarus in Abraham's bosom becomes very significant, and teaches us that there is after death a moral (at least,) if not a physical impossibility, which keeps apart the wicked from the good.—Now, a moral difficulty is more impassable than a physical, and the company and society of good men will be shunned by the bad, as the society of the evil will be impossible to the good.

They that know anything of moral natures, and of the law of habits, how can they expect that the miracle which they propose should be wrought; that the devil should be brought to God; or his evil associates, whether demons or fallen men, should seek their happiness in heavenly courts. It is too true, that between the two natures of the redeemed and the lost soul there is an irrevocable barrier, by the sternest necessity, fixed; as impassable as the gulf which our SAVIOUR represents as existing between Lazarus in Abraham's bosom and the rich man in hell.

1032. Q. Why do you conclude this so absolutely?

A. In the place where the tree falleth, there shall it be, Eccles. xi. 3. There is no change to be wrought in man within those flames, no purgation of his sins, no justification of his person, and therefore no salvation of him. Without the mediation of CHRIST, no man shall ever enter into heaven, and when He hath delivered up the kingdom to GOD, even the FATHER, then shall the office of the Mediator cease.

"So groundless was the opinion of Origen, who conceived that after some number of years the damned should be released from their torments, and made partakers of the joys of heaven, or at least try their fortunes in such regions of the world as he conceived should be reserved for their habitation." Pearson.

Note.—Some have expressed a hope that at the day of judgment those men who are not admitted to happiness may be so dealt with, as that the perverted may be restored to the bosom of the universal Parent. This was an idea of Origen's, and it may be thought very probable that God's goodness is so great that if it were possible in the nature of things, that even the fallen angels, even the devil himself, could be restored to angelic goodness, He would proceed to effect it—much more if erring beings such as man could be renewed. But it seems to be entirely overlooked by those who propose this hope, that the question is not whether GOD will pardon and restore, but whether if pardoned, the beings in question could be restored. Have they not been tried to the uttermost in the days of probation?

and now is it said, Then shall they call upon Me but I will not answer; they would none of My counsel, therefore shall they eat of the fruit of their own way. Prov. i. 28—31.

In effect, let it be considered, how it is, by the Gospel, proposed to work the marvellous conversion of the soul to God—not by mere pardon—not by mere decree of act of oblivion on men's sins, but by pardon accompanied with a gift of grace, which must, like the talent of the austere lord, be cultivated to an usurious profit. Where then sacraments and all gifts of grace have been in vain employed during the days of grace, or have been rejected, and soul and body have become hardened to their action, how would it be possible to save the condemned sinner by the laws of another Gospel? Are we not taught that even in this world there are those to whom it is an impossibility to renew them again unto repentance? Heb. vi. 4—6.

1033. *Q.* But does it not seem hard that one measure of punishment should be allotted to all alike, since all will not have sinned alike?

*A.* All are cast out alike from the presence of God, who have not obeyed His Christ; but otherwise the punishment may be as diverse as the nature and depth of the sin.

The punishment which will be inflicted upon them will be doubtless proportionate to their sins, as a recompence of their demerits, so that no man shall suffer more than he hath deserved.

*Pearson.*

*Note.*—For those who are cast out from God's presence, this tremendous punishment, of itself considered, falls on all alike. Again, a companionship of wicked men must, to a large extent,

make the punishment the same to all; but the character of some may have *degrees* of aversion from God, and lesser aptitudes to evil, and so far we may suppose would be open to less degrees of punishment.

In this very fact, might it not be seen how necessary is the action of God's direct and absolute interference in judgment; for without it, the less wicked would be consigned to the companionship of the most evil, and the same indiscriminating punishment be inflicted on all alike; whereas, by an award according to their wickedness, separate abodes in the vast regions of hell, might be allotted to its unhappy inmates. As to the blessed inhabitants of heaven, there are many mansions and divers degrees of bliss awarded.

1034. *Q.* In what will the happiness of the righteous after the judgment consist?

*A.* They will be placed in a most glorious and perfect state, free from all possibility of sinning and offending God, and from all suffering, misery, and want, (Rev. xxii. 4,) where they shall enjoy all the pleasure and satisfaction that their natures then enlarged shall be capable of. (1 Cor. xv. 42; 1 Cor. xiii. 12; Phil. iii. 21.) *Wake.*

“Our SAVIOUR tells us that we shall be as the angels of God in heaven, (S. Matt. xxii. 30.) S. John that though it doth not yet appear what we shall be, this we know, that when God shall appear we shall be like Him, (1 S. John iii. 2.) Now, to be like God implies everything desirable. The Scriptures use the noblest images of all that is, in this world, great and splendid and capable of giving the most exalted satisfaction, to repre-

sent that happiness figuratively which cannot literally be described."

Our vile bodies shall be fashioned like unto the glorious body of our Blessed **LORD**, (Phil. iii. 21,) which in His temporary transfiguration here on earth shone as the sun, and His raiment was white as the light. They shall be freed from all tendency to decay and disorder, and become unwearyed instruments for every excellent purpose, to that better part which they used to *press down*. Wisdom ix. 15. They shall doubtless have such gratifications allotted to them, as will suit, though not their present gross nature, yet their future spiritual condition, and be adorned with all the dignity and beauty that ought naturally to accompany absolute innocence, universal love, divine favour, and heavenly joy.

Then for our minds, when once the spirits of just men are made perfect, Heb. xii. 23, as they shall be in every thing worthy and amiable, what pleasure must we take in meeting again the dear objects of our former affections, now become infinitely more deserving of them; in conversing with all the great and good persons that ever were, concerning the various scenes of this present world, and the blessed exchange that we have made of it for a better; in learning from them, and that innumerable company of angels, (Heb. xii. 22,) which minister to **God's** will, continually new instruction concerning all His works of nature, providence, and grace. Nor can it be questioned, but such employments too, however beyond our reach to guess at them now, will be assigned to each person, as shall produce him high honour and equal happiness. *Secker.*

"The understanding shall be raised to the utmost capacity, and that capacity completely filled.

Our wills shall be perfected with holiness, with exact conformity to the will of God, and perfect liberty from all servitude of sin; they shall be troubled with no doubtful choice, but with their radical and fundamental freedom shall they embrace the greatest good. Our affections shall be all set right by an unalterable regulation, and in that regularity shall receive absolute satisfaction; and all this shall be effected that we may thereby be made capable and then happy by a full fruition." *Pearson.*

To this internal perfection is added a proportionately happy condition, consisting in an absolute freedom from all pain, misery, labour, and want; an hereditary possession of all good, with an unspeakable complacency and joy flowing from it, and all this redounding from the vision and fruition of God—this is *the life*.

1035. Q. What is our natural view of a state, in which goodness is dominant as a principle?

A. That must be a wonderful state of happiness, in which goodness will have its natural effect and influence—in which the follies and failings—not to say the sins of men, will create no disappointments and miseries, disconcerting the plans of the good.

" But let us return to the earth our habitation, and we shall see this happy tendency of virtue, by imagining an instance not so vast and remote—by supposing a kingdom or society of men upon it, perfectly virtuous, for a succession of many ages, to which, if you please, may be given a situation advantageous for universal monarchy. In such a state there would be no such thing as faction; but men of the greatest capacity would,

of course, all along, have the chief direction of affairs willingly yielded to them, and they would share it among themselves without envy. Each of these would have the post assigned him to which his genius was peculiarly adapted ; and others, who had not any distinguished genius would be safe and think themselves very happy, by being under the protection and guidance of those who had. Public determinations would really be the result of the united wisdom of the community, and they would faithfully be executed by the united strength of it. Some would in a higher way contribute, but all would in some way contribute to the public prosperity, and in it, each would enjoy the fruits of his own virtue. And as injustice, whether by fraud or force, would be unknown among themselves, so they would be sufficiently secured from it in their neighbours. For cunning and false self-interest, confederacies in injustice, ever slight, and accompanied with faction and intestine treachery ; these on one hand, would be found mere childish folly and weakness, when set in opposition against wisdom, public spirit, union inviolable, and fidelity on the other ; allowing both a sufficient length of years to try their force. Add the general influence which such a kingdom would have over the face of the earth by way of example particularly, and the reverence which would be paid it. It would plainly be superior to all others, and the world must gradually come under its empire, not by means of lawless violence, but partly by what must be allowed to be just conquest, and partly by other kingdoms submitting themselves voluntarily to it, throughout a course of ages, and claiming its protection, one after another in successive exigencies. The head of it would be an

universal monarch, in another sense than any mortal has yet been, and the eastern style would be literally applicable to him, that 'all people, nations, and languages should serve him.'"  
*Butler's Anal.*, I., ch. iii.

" Neglected as it (virtue) is, perhaps unknown, perhaps despised and oppressed here; there may be scenes in eternity, lasting enough, and in every other way adapted, to afford it a sufficient sphere of action, and a sufficient sphere for the natural consequences of it to follow in fact. If the soul be naturally immortal, and this state be a progress towards a future one, as childhood is towards mature age; good men may naturally unite, not only amongst themselves, but also with other orders of virtuous creatures, in that future state." *Butler's Anal.*, Pt. I., i. 3.

1036. Q. You have already spoken of saints (Questions 976, &c.,) raised to sit on thrones, with their **LORD**, and judge the nations, and thus far acknowledge a disparity of rewards;—is a difference in the degrees of recompence, happiness, or estate in the eternal kingdom to be understood also?

A. There seems to be no more striking evidence in Scripture for any doctrine, than for that of the difference of degrees in heavenly glory. The prophet Daniel declares that those that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness shall be as the stars for ever and ever.

Our **SAVIOUR** by the parable of the talents, instructs us not only that the negligent and unfruitful shall suffer an allotted punishment, and

that the wise and diligent shall reap a proportionate reward, but that unto him that hath much, shall be given more. (S. Luke xix. 15; also S. Luke xii. 48.)

1037. *Q.* How do you interpret the passage, "In My FATHER's house there are many mansions?"

*A.* If we take in connection with it, the other passage, "But to sit on My right hand and on My left, is not Mine to give," &c., we see that the existence of these exalted posts cannot be denied. So S. Matt. xix. 28.

1038. *Q.* Are we to look upon them in the light of rewards?

*A.* S. Matt. xvi. 27. Our SAVIOUR shall reward every man according to his works.

1039. *Q.* Will the degree of punishment be proportioned to the degree of evil?

*A.* The degrees of rewards shall be proportioned to the degrees of good and evil, which men shall have done here on earth; i.e., a more eminent degree of piety and holiness here, shall be rewarded with a proportionably greater share of glory and happiness hereafter; and greater and more heinous sins shall then be loaded with greater and heavier punishments. *Greene's Four Last Things*, 130.

1040. *Q.* Do the orders of angels suggest any probability in this question?

*A.* It is probable, that as there are represented in Scripture a diversity of orders, as angels, archangels, principalities, and powers, cherubims, and seraphims; so it would be in the orders of men when raised to the heavenly seats.

Seeing that we are to be like the angels, (S. Luke xx. 36,) why then should we differ from them in respect to the nature of the communion, so as to become a levelled society? *Bishop Greene.*

1041. Q. What objection is raised to this doctrine in the minds of some?

A. They urge, that as CHRIST died for all, and that we are not saved by our own merits, but by His alone; therefore, all will have the application of those merits in an equal degree, and all, therefore, be made partakers of the same degrees of glory. *Bishop Greene.*

1042. Q. What answer is to be made to this?

A. That though CHRIST's redemption availed to place them once for all on the threshold of His kingdom, and gave to each the same privileges of the HOLY GHOST, it does not follow that they will all in equal degrees co-operate in this life with the workings of His grace, and many must lag behind in the race, even although they "so run as to obtain," and are not cast out from all claim as winners.

1043. Q. But in the parable of the labourers every one received only a penny.

A. That parable was to show the dispensation of CHRIST to the Gentiles, and to justify GOD's proceedings, in giving them the same privileges in the Gospel kingdom as the Jew.

1044. Q. Is any argument to be drawn from the justice and equity of GOD?

A. It is scarcely possible, but that those who have shown a greater zeal for the glory of GOD,

and have more excelled in sanctity, should, in a judgment in which men are to be rewarded according to their deeds, have higher degrees of glory in the heavenly mansions. 1 S. Pet. iv. 13.

1045. Q. What is to be concluded from the reason of the thing?

A. From the reason of the thing it cannot well be otherwise, but that the more pure and holy men have been in this world, the more capable they will be of the happiness of the next, as being the better prepared and disposed for a fuller enjoyment of God. *Greene.*

1046. Q. What is S. Paul's resemblance from sowing and reaping to this effect?

A. "He that soweth sparingly shall reap sparingly; and he that soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully;" clearly implying a proportionately more abundant reward in the next world.

1047. Q. But would not then some come short of that fulness of happiness which we are taught to expect that all would have?

A. Though there be different degrees of glory in the life to come, yet this difference will occasion no envious feelings among the saints above, but all shall be entirely happy, because to every saint in that blessed place, his own degree shall be to him a satisfactory beatitude. *Greene.*

Represented by the Israelites' gathering of manna, "He that gathered much had nothing over, and he that gathered little had no lack, they gathered every man according to his own eating." Exod. xvi. 18. *Greene.* 137.

"The emanations of happiness indeed are dif-

fused everywhere from God, as the common fountain of celestial bliss, and perhaps do fill all the saints alike ; but then though every capacity shall be filled, yet their capacities and dispositions for them being unequal, some may receive a greater measure and proportion of them than others, and so consequently be more happy than they are. Just as the light of the sun is the same, and yet its rays are received in a greater or lesser quantity, according to the make or texture of the body it shines upon." *Greene.*

This may likewise be expressed by a common similitude, of many vessels of different sizes and capacities, some greater, and some lesser ; when if all of them be filled, it is the same thing ; one is not then fuller than another. So if the blessed saints above shall all receive their full proportion of happiness according to their capacities, all will be entirely satisfied with that proportion. *Greene.*

1048. *Q.* In what terms are the great glories and the exceeding happiness of heaven spoken of in Scripture ?

*A.* S. Paul declares that "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive the things that God has prepared for them that love Him." 1 Cor. ii. 9.

1049. *Q.* Knowing this, what should be our consequent practice ?

*A.* We should endeavour to arrest our thoughts upon the contemplation of heavenly happiness, placing our affections in heaven, that where our heart is there may our treasure be found to be. We must learn to make things future as it were present to us ; we must not allow our minds to

be so absorbed in things present, as never seriously to think of the future life, and thus never qualify and prepare ourselves for acting our part in its concerns.

“It is greatly to be feared that among those multitudes of professed Christians that perish everlasting, there are as many at least that miscarry for want of a serious consideration of the things they believe, as for want of the belief itself; and that unthinking believers take up a great room in the regions of darkness.” *Greene.*

1050. *Q.* What should be our conduct consequent on the belief of higher degrees of glory hereafter?

*A.* It should stir us up to a more diligent and zealous pursuit after a fresh increase of grace and virtue, and a more earnest proficiency in the ways of righteousness, so as to qualify us for the reception of ever-enlarging capacities of happiness and glory. 2 Cor. iv. 17.

“A vigorous sense of this truth would awaken and arouse us out of our remissness and negligence in the business of religion. How many precious hours of our time would it redeem from being spent and lost in vanity and folly. Every opportunity of doing good would be accounted an advantage offered us by the good providence of GOD, further to enrich our souls, and to add to our heavenly store and treasure.” *Bishop Greene.*

1051. *Q.* What should we do on a review of the terrors and mercies of the LORD?

*A.* We should all make the use that we ought both of the terrors and mercies of the LORD;

awing ourselves by the former from transgressing our duty, and encouraging ourselves by the latter to the utmost diligence in performing it, that so we may pass through life with comfort, meet death with cheerfulness, and having faithfully served God in this world, be eternally and abundantly rewarded by Him in the next. *Secker.*

1052. Q. Can you obtain by reflection any idea of eternity, which may be profitable?

A. It is good to compare it with the most extensive intervals which can be taken in by our conceptions; to think of a thousand or even ten thousand years spent in bliss or in misery; and then to reflect, that after it is over, there is yet an infinite period to succeed.

1053. Q. And in connection with this thought, what text of Scripture concerning the Resurrection, seems most awful?

A. All that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation. S. John v. 29.

*It may now be pointed out by the Catechist, that the summary interpretation of the Creed, as given in the Church Catechism, and alluded to at Question 274, requires, of course, no further treatment, inasmuch as the Creed itself has received the fullest interpretation, in accordance with the view suggested by it.*

## APPENDIX I.

### REFERRED TO AT Q. 462.

#### *On the Sacrifice of CHRIST.*

I. The universality of animal, even of human sacrifices is proclaimed by history.

M. de Pauuw, (Rech. Phil. sur les Americ. V. I., p. 211,) asserts that there is no nation mentioned in history, whom we cannot reproach with having more than once made the blood of its citizens to be drawn forth to appease the divinity when he appeared angry. Examples might be multiplied indefinitely. See *Magee*, 90, 91.

II. The practice being entirely abhorrent from the feelings and sentiments of human nature, therefore it must have been instituted.

*Note.*—Kennicot fr. Delaney, *Magee*, 309. “Whatever practice has obtained universally, must have obtained from reason, nature, interest or injunction of universal authority. Now animal sacrifice did not obtain from reason; for no reasonable notions of God could teach men, that He could take delight in blood or in the fat of slain beasts—nor will any man say that we have any *natural* instinct to gratify in spilling innocent blood—nor could there be any temptation from appetite to do this in those ages, when the whole sacrifice was consumed by fire; or when, if it was not, yet men wholly abstained from flesh, and consequently, neither did this practice owe its influence to any prin-

ciple of interest, but must have been founded in an authority, whose influence was as powerful as the practice was universal, and that could have been none but the authority of God the Sovereign of the world." In accordance with the tenour of the foregoing note,—observe, that Pythagoras, Plato, and Porphyry, and others, express their wonder, how an institution so dismal and big with absurdity, could have spread through the world.

### III. The Divine acceptance of the offering, a proof of the Divine institution of animal sacrifice.

We find Abel offering the sacrifice of the firstlings of the flock, and that his offering was more acceptable than that of his brother Cain, which was of the first-fruits of the earth, in that he offered by faith.

1. Now the Divine acceptance of the offering, is a proof of its Divine ordinance. Abel's sacrifice could not have been acceptable, if it had been the commandment of men and not of God. (S. Mark vii. 7.) Acceptance is marked on Noah's burnt-offering in the fact of God's "smelling a sweet savour," and in Job's offering for his children. (Job i.)

2. But the Divine acceptance of sacrifices was sensibly attested by fire descending from heaven to consume them. Heidegger thinks that the Scriptures leave us no room to doubt that the patriarchs were favoured with this sign of Divine acceptance. The fathers and the Jewish doctors unanimously agree that the sacrifice of Abel was so accepted. It was certainly vouchsafed in later times, e.g., the sacrifice of Abraham, (Gen. xv. 17,) and under the law, this was the usual way of acceptance, (Levit. ix. 24; Judges vi. 21; 1 Kings xviii. 38; 1 Chron. xxi. 26; 2 Chron. vii. 1, &c.) Hence, to accept a burnt-sacrifice is called in the Hebrew (Ps. xx. 3,) to burn it into ashes. Traces are to be found even in heathen tradition; Servius on Aen. xii. 200, says, "Amongst the ancients, fire was not lighted upon the altar, but by prayer they called down fire from heaven, which consumed the offering."

3. Abel must have acted upon a Divine command, since, if God Who as the Creator only has the power of conferring the right of taking away the life of His creatures, had not given such a right to Abel, what was to induce him to take such life away? But the right to slay animals for food, was not given till after the flood, (Gen. ix. 3,) before which time, man's food was confined only to things that grew out of the earth, (Gen. i. 29,) and it was only after that time, that festivities accompanied the rites of sacrifice as symbolic of friendship and cessation of hostilities, (Gen. viii. 19, 20; ix. 3, 4,) quoted by Thorndike. But both before and a long time after the flood, animal sacrifices were holocausts, the whole of the animal being consumed upon the altars. *Thorndike*, p. 540, Vol. III., Part 2.

#### *On Propitiation.*

I. It has been objected to the doctrines of sacrifice and propitiation that they represent God as implacable, to which answer is made,—The sacrifice of CHRIST was never deemed by any, who did not wish to calumniate the doctrine of atonement, to have made God placable, but was merely viewed as the *means appointed* by Divine wisdom, by which to bestow forgiveness. S. John iii. 16; 1 S. John iv. 10; 1 S. Pet. i. 18—20, all point to this fore-ordination. *Magee.*

II. It should also be remembered, that though we have no reason to think that God is influenced by the passions, which issue in the wrath of kings and human potentates: yet that the results of His perfect justice must resemble the effects of human passion and resentment, whilst no less effectual is His mercy than if He were moved by the bowels of a human compassion.

III. But to all arguments against the notion of God's entertaining wrath, displeasure, &c., let it be observed, that the displeasure of God is not like man's displeasure, a resentment of passion, but a judicial disappro-

bation, which if we abstract from our notion of God, we must cease to view Him as the moral Governor of the world.

*Note.*—It is from the want of this distinction, which is so highly necessary, and the consequent fear of degrading the Deity, by attributing to Him what might appear the weakness of passion ; that they who trust to reason more than to Scripture, have been withheld from admitting any principle that implied displeasure on the part of God.

*Contra.*—The language of Scripture is direct in its declaration of the wrath of God against the disobedient. Heb. x. 26, 27 ; Rom. v. 9, 10.

IV. “Whereas it has been affirmed that all men naturally apprehend the Deity to be propitious ; that no nation whatever, either Jew or heathen, ancient or modern, appears to have had the least knowledge or to betray the least sense of this want of *any* expedient of satisfaction for sin, besides repentance and a good life, and that from a full review of the religions of all ancient and modern nations, they appear to be utterly destitute of anything like a doctrine of proper atonement.” (Dr. Priestley, in Theol. Rep. v. i. 401—416.) In the face of these precipitate assertions of Dr. Priestley, we must observe that there are the most ample—

*Proofs in Antiquity that Sacrifice was to propitiate Divinity.*

That God’s displeasure is to be averted by sacrifice, is to be seen in the instance of the three friends of Job, to whom, after saying that His wrath is kindled against them, because they had not spoken of Him the thing “that was right,” He orders that they should offer up a sacrifice as the way of averting His anger.

The universal sense of the want of something to appease the Divine anger, from whatever source arising,

whether from early traditions of the Fall, or from, (what is least probable, an innate consciousness of its necessity,) most clearly existed. We shall find that almost the entire of the religions of the ancients consisted in rites of deprecation ; fear of the Divine displeasure seems to have been the leading feature in their religious impressions,—and in the diversity, the costliness, and the cruelty of their sacrifices, they sought to appease gods, to whose wrath they felt themselves exposed, from a consciousness of sin, unrelieved by any information as to the means of escaping its effects—so strikingly predominant was this feature of terror, in the Gentile superstitions, that we find it expressly laid down by Herod. i. 32, Τὸ θεῖον πᾶν φθονερὸν τε καὶ ταραχῶδες, and Porphyry directly asserts “ that there was wanting some universal method of delivering men’s souls, which no sect of philosophy had ever yet found out ; ” (August. de Civit. Dei, Lib. x. cap. 32;) that is, that something besides their own repentance was wanting to appease the anger of their gods.

*Rationale of shedding of Blood for remission of Sins.*

“ Death was threatened to sin before it was born, (Gen. ii. 17.) which was to be made good. Our life was thus devoted to God ; i.e., laid under the curse of God’s indignation or justice, and for its sake, the blood, which because it was its (our life’s) vehicle was forbidden to be eaten, (blood which is the life thereof) was not ours, but was forfeited to God by our sin. This blood thus forfeited to God He gave to us again, not to eat, or to our own common use, but to a new use, to be a type of the Blood of CHRIST, which only has virtue to make atonement for our sin. And in its (i.e. the Blood of CHRIST) virtue only, its type the blood of the legal sacrifices, was said to make atonement for our souls. (Lev. xvii. 11.)” *Leslie.*

No force in the objection brought from such passages, as Ps. l., li., xl. (which represent God as not delighting in burnt-offerings), against this atoning virtue.

The words are used in a comparative sense only, if the argument be carried further it will prove too much, viz., that sacrifices had not been ordained by God. See Isa. i. 11, 12; lxvi. 3; Prov. xv. 8; Amos v. 21, 22.

*Magee*, 105. The Greek and Roman poets, the popular divines of the ancients, leave little doubt how strongly and generally the heathen retained the tradition of an atonement or expiation for sin. Thus (Hom. Il. i. 386,) we find the expression *θεύ λάσκεσθαι*, so used as necessarily to imply the appeasing the anger of the god. Again, (Il. ii. 550,) the same expression is employed to denote the propitiation of Minerva by sacrifice, *Ἐρθάδε μν ταύρους καὶ ἀρειοῖς λάσονται*. Hesiod (*Ἐργ. καὶ Ήμ.* 338,) having declared the certainty that the wicked would be visited by the Divine vengeance, proceeds to recommend sacrifice to render the deity propitious, *Ἄλλοτε δὴ στοιδῆσι θυέσσιτε λάσκεσθαι*. The Latin writers use the words placere, propitiare, expiare, litare, placamen, placulum, with the greatest clearness of application; thus, Horace, (lib. ii. Sat. iii.,) “Prudens placavi sanguine Divos;” and (lib. i. Ode 28,) “Teque piacula nulla solvent:” and in his second ode he proposed the question, “Cui dabit partes scelus expiandi Jupiter?” Cæsar speaking of the Gauls says, “Pro vita hominis nisi vita hominis reddatur, non posse deorum immortalium numen placari arbitrantur.” Cic. de Nat. Deor. lib. iii. cap. 6, says, “Tu autem etiam Deicorum *devotionibus placatos* Deos ease censes.” Sil. Ital. of the Carthaginians, says,

“Mos fuit in populis, quos condidit advena Dido  
Poscere cæde Deos veniam, ac flagrantibus aris  
(Infandum dictu) parvos imponere natos.”

Virgil likewise, *Aen.* ii. 116:  
“Sanguine placastis ventos, et virgine cæsâ,  
Sanguine querendi redditus, animâque litandum  
Argolicâ.”

In that predominating terror—that *δεισιδαιμονία*,

which has in every age and clime absorbed the religion of the Gentiles, the natural (qy., or acquired) sentiment of the human mind may be easily discerned. *Magee*, 136.

*Death of CHRIST not in attestation merely, but an offering for Sins.*

Observe 1. The death of CHRIST an offering for sins, (1 S. Pet. i. 18, 19; S. John i. 29; S. Matt. xxvi. 28.)

2. CHRIST is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. Now, were it said that He was slain from the beginning, this might alone be understood merely of His being fore-ordained to death for whatever purpose, but the declaration of His being the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, can only be understood as referring to animal sacrifices established from the beginning and interpreted accordingly in connection with them.

So S. John i. 29, 36; Rev. i. 5; Rev. v. 9; Rev. xiii. 8. Thorndike says, The persons who speak here, knew well enough what creatures were sacrificed, and yet declare that CHRIST was figured by lambs.

3. The sacrifice of Isaac in will by Abraham was not in attestation.

*Note.*—Probably, it laid the foundation (in connection with the general expectation of an anthropomorphic deity, appointed to suffering, to “be bruised in the heel,” Gen. iii. 15, i.e., to sufferings in His human nature,) of the practice of human sacrifice, as interpretations of, and more potent in its results than animal sacrifice. Our forefathers rightly collected with Eve, from the terms of the first promise, that an anthropomorphic Deity was to effect the deliverance of man from the primæval curse. “They made this hope of a promised Redeemer, though with a mischievously perverse ingenuity, the very basis of their apostasy itself. The whole ritual was built upon the

avowed belief of the peculiar efficacy of sacrifice, and though they multiplied their hero-gods at pleasure, while they assigned to them as their fittest habitation the brilliant host of heaven ; still the remote prototype of each venerated demon was the predicted seed of the woman supposed to have corporeally manifested himself in this or that illustrious human character." *Faber's Three Dispensations*, Vol. II., p. 5.

Abraham's sacrifice could have been demanded with no other view than to show that a human sacrifice was at some future period to consummate the plan of God's salvation. This agrees with the typical character of Abraham's sacrifice of his son : his representation of God as the FATHER, Isaac of CHRIST, &c., in all which there is no idea of mere feast or offering to God, but propitiation, as a ram is received in the stead figuring again CHRIST as the atonement,—the sacrifice (symbolised) which God was to provide for Himself.

4. The Death of CHRIST is spoken of in the same sacrificial terms as had been applied to the sacrificial offerings of old, and is therefore atoning and expiatory equally with them. Isa. liii. 5, 8; S. Matt. xxvi. 28; Acts viii. 32, 33; 1 Cor. v. 7; 1 S. Pet. i. 18, 19.

5. These sacrifices were ordained from the fall of Adam to prefigure the death of CHRIST, and to teach us that without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins. Lev. xvi. 26; Heb. ix. 22.

*Note.*—Thorndike's view is that all sacrifices are figures of CHRIST, and our reconciliation with God by the same. Vol. II., part 2, p. 537.

#### *Need of Mediatorial Priest and Intercessor.*

Mediation, (from *medius*, Latin, middle,) represents our SAVIOUR's office of a mediator, or one who goes between GOD and man, the idea being of such a breach between an offended king and a rebel people, that only the intervention of a third party will suffice to heal it.

Intercession, (*inter*, between, and *cedo*, to go, Lat.,) contains the same notion with the idea of speaking in “ behalf of another” superadded.

I. Now, it is contended that in Holy Scripture there is no trace of any mediator in the sense of any merit being attached to sufferings or death, and that the declarations of Holy Scripture to the truly penitent, are made without reserve; but examples to the contrary are not wanting.

When God had declared that He would destroy the Israelites for their idolatry, (Deut. ix.,) and again, for their intended violence against Caleb and Joshua, (Num. xiv.,) yet upon the intercession of Moses, He is said to have forgiven them—in like manner, for the sake of ten righteous persons He would have spared Sodom, (Gen. xviii. 32,)—in remembrance of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and for their *sakes*, He is represented as being merciful to their posterity, (Gen. xxvi. 24.) He forgave Abimelech also upon the prayer of Abraham, (Gen. xx. 17,) and the friends of Job upon the solicitation of that patriarch, (Job xlvi. 10,) and what renders these two last instances particularly strong, is, that whilst He declares the purpose of forgiveness, He at the same time expressly prescribes the mediation, by which it was to be obtained.

“ There is no sort of objection, from the light of nature, against the notion of a mediator between God and man, considered as a doctrine of Christianity, or as an appointment in this dispensation; since, we find by experience, that God does appoint mediators, to be the instruments of good and evil to us, the instruments of His justice and His mercy.” *Butler's Anal.* Pt. II., c. 5.

The effects of vice in the present world are often extreme misery, irretrievable ruin, and even death; and upon putting all this together, it will appear, that as no one can say, in what degree fatal the unperverted consequences of vice may be, according to the general rule of Divine government; so it is by no

means intuitively certain, how far these consequences could possibly, in the nature of the thing be prevented, consistently with the eternal rule of right, or with what is, in fact, the moral constitution of nature. However, there would be large ground to hope, that the universal government was not so severely strict, but that there was room for pardon, or for having those penal consequences prevented. Yet there seems no probability, that anything we could do, would alone, and of itself, prevent them; prevent their following or being inflicted. *Butler's Anal.* Pt. II., c. 5.

People ruin their fortunes by extravagance; they bring diseases upon their body by excess; they incur the penalties of civil laws—will sorrow for their follies past, and behaving well for the future, alone and of itself prevent the natural consequences of them? On the contrary, men's natural abilities of assisting themselves are often impaired; or if not, yet they are forced to be beholden to the assistance of others, &c. Why is it not supposable that this may not be our case also, in our more important capacity, as under His perfect moral government, and having a more general and future interest depending? If we have misbelieved in this higher capacity, and rendered ourselves obnoxious to the future punishment, which God has annexed to vice, it is plainly credible, that behaving well for the time to come, may be not useless, God forbid,—but wholly insufficient—alone and of itself, to prevent that punishment, or put us in the condition, which we should have been in, had we preserved our innocence. *Butler's Anal.*, Pt. II., c. 5.

Though the efficacy of repentance itself alone, to prevent what mankind had rendered themselves obnoxious to, and recover what they had forfeited, is now insisted upon, in opposition to Christianity; yet, by the general prevalence of propitiatory sacrifices over the heathen world, this notion of repentance alone being sufficient to expiate guilt, appears to be contrary to the general sense of mankind.

Upon the whole, then, had the laws, the general

laws of God's government, been permitted to operate without any interposition in our behalf, the future punishment, for aught we know to the contrary, or have any reason to think, must inevitably have followed, notwithstanding anything that we could have done to prevent it." *Butler's Anal.* Pt. II., c. 5.

II. When it is objected that no mediator or intercessor is required for man, that repentance and reformation of life are alone necessary to place the sinner in the same favour with God as before he sinned, we must perceive that reasoning from what we know, indemnity is not the consequence of repentance in this life. A man suffers the effects of sin, or moral faults, or failings. God does not interfere to prevent this. What reason have we to suppose He will act differently for another world? Will He arbitrarily alter a man's nature and habits?—but He would do so, if punishment were not designed by Him to outlive the crime.

"Sacrifices of expiation were commanded the Jews, and obtained amongst most other nations, from tradition, whose original probably was revelation. And they were continually repeated, both occasionally, and at the return of stated times, and made up great part of the external religion of mankind. *But now once in the end of the world CHRIST hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself*, Heb. ix. 26. And this sacrifice was, in the highest degree, and with the most extensive influence, of that efficacy for obtaining pardon of sin, which the heathens may be supposed to have thought their sacrifices to have been, and which the Jewish sacrifices really were in some degree, and with regard to some persons." *Butler's Anal.*, Pt. II., c. 5.

2ndly, From abstract reason. Can repentance annihilate what is past? or can we do more by present obedience than acquit ourselves of present obligation? The abstract reason of the thing can furnish no link,

whereby to connect present obedience with forgiveness of former sins.

"The case of penitence is clearly different from that of innocence—it implies a mixture of guilt pre-contracted, and punishment proportionably deserved—it is consequently inconsistent with rectitude, that both should be treated alike by God." *Balney, Essay on Redemption*, 31.

Objection III., Of deists against the necessity of any mediation. It is either agreeable to the will of God to grant salvation on repentance, and then He will grant it without a mediator, or it is not agreeable to His will, and then a mediator can be of no avail, unless we admit that God can change His purposes, and that His decrees are mutable.

Answer, This objection proves too much—for prayer and repentance would be equally useless and unnecessary—for we might say, if it be fit our sins should be forgiven, God could forgive them without prayer and without repentance, and if it be unfit, repentance can be of no avail. *Magee*, 13.

Objection IV., That CHRIST was only sent into the world to promulgate God's will—by His life to set us an example of perfect obedience—by His death to manifest His sincerity.

Answer 1. This would be to make Christianity only a more formal promulgation of the religion of nature.

2. To leave us to the merit of our own obedience for acceptance and salvation, and we have abundant experience of what man can do when left to his own exertions. *Rom. i. 29, &c.*

3. To give mankind a law which by clearly manifesting God's will, leaves them less excusable in their transgressions, and then subjects them to be judged by its rigour.

4. It is a system which neither warns nor arouses by images of terror expressive of God's abhorrence of

sin ; nor moves to duty by manifestations of the greatness of God's love.

*Satisfaction, Reconciliation, Propitiation, Expiation, Atonement, Oblation, Vicarious, Redemption.*

Satisfaction as made to man is the giving compensation for some injury done, and in the eye of justice to be "full, perfect, and sufficient, it must equal the offence." *Hooker.* "And as it is the principle of justice to demand a complete satisfaction, so from the nature of God must He require it, since He is justice." *Leslie.* That complete satisfaction, therefore, which man was unable of himself to render, God ordained in the person of His Son, both God and man, presenting a perfect human obedience, rendered infinite in value by the Divine character of Him Who offers it.

Reconciliation. The necessity for our being reconciled to God, implies the Divine displeasure, which it is necessary by some means to avert.

Propitiation (Lat. *propitio*, to appease,) is sacrifice made to God for the sins of men, which He is pleased to accept of as a sufficient satisfaction for the dishonour that was done Him by them, so as not to require the punishments which were due unto Him for them, but to forgive them all, and to become again as propitious to the persons that offended Him, as if He had never been offended by them. *Beveridge.*

Expiation, (*Expiare*,—*ex*, and *piare*, from *pius*, *Richardson.*) To pacify God by sacrifice and prayer.

Atonement. The origin of the word would appear to give us the same meaning as reconciliation, viz., parties at issue being set at one again, and hence at-one-ment. But as with the word propitiation it has a further meaning, and by substituting the cause for the effect, it now signifies the means of reconciliation, viz., the sacrifice made to God by Jesus Christ of His death, to satisfy His wrath against sin.

*Note.*—It is a word but once used in the New Testament, and that properly translated means reconciliation; but this is of no importance, the notion implied in the Atonement being found therein *passim*. See 161, *Magee*, see also 192, and following pages.

Oblation, (Lat. *ob, fero*, whence offering, part. *oblatus*, whence *oblatio*, and Eng. oblation.) An offering for sin. “One oblation of Himself once offered.” (Eph. v. 2; Heb. vii. 27; Isa. liii. 10.)

Vicarious, from *vice*, in the stead of, (hence viceroy, vicar.)

Objection V. That it is nowhere said in Scripture that GOD is reconciled to us by CHRIST’s death, but that we are everywhere said to be reconciled to GOD.

Answer, Consult S. Matt. v. 23, 24. Here the party offending is the party to be reconciled to him who had been offended, by *agreeing to his terms* of reconciliation. This use of the word evidently points out that our being reconciled to GOD, does not mean our giving up our sins, and thereby laying aside our enmity to GOD, (in which sense the objection supposes it to be taken) but the turning away His displeasure whereby we are enabled to regain His favour. Consult 2 Cor. v. 19; see also Col. i. 20.

Socinus marvels how any man can imagine, that CHRIST can proffer us reconciliation, and not be reconciled to us when He proffers it. An imagination as ridiculous as his, that fancied he should meet his fellow, before his fellow met him. For if reconciliation be between two, though one may provide the means (as in our case GOD), though out of love, yet, seeing as yet He only offers friendship, that is to say, seeing as yet we are not made friends, it is manifest that both are not reconciled at once. And does not experience of the world show, that when princes and states are at war, the one out of a desire of peace seeks means of reconciliation, but is not reconciled before

the other agree. So God engages to be reconciled, by publishing the Gospel, while He gives man leave to deliberate ; but is not reconciled till man undertake Christianity by being baptised. *Thorndike*, Vol. III. 557.

**Objection VI.** Why was there a necessity to make satisfaction to the justice of God ? Cannot God forgive without any violence being done to His justice ? There is no injustice in me, if I forgive a debt without requiring satisfaction.

**Answer.** If it is not injustice, it certainly cannot be called justice, for justice would exact to the uttermost farthing. It is called mercy ; to forgive is mercy and not justice. There is a great difference between justice and mercy as seen in God and man. In men there is a mixture of both, and sometimes we exert our justice and sometimes our mercy. And in some men their justice is greater than their mercy, and in others their mercy exceeds their justice. He is both to the utmost, that is, infinitely. His justice must not take anything from His mercy, nor His mercy from His justice ; every one of His attributes must be full, and complete, and entire in itself. Therefore, God is not only just, that is, has some justice in Him, or a certain measure of justice, but He is justice itself, justice in the abstract, and whatever agrees to justice, to the nature of justice, that must be in God. *Leslie*. Socinian Controversy.

**Objection VII.** But how was it possible that man should be in a condition to render a perfect or infinite satisfaction to God ?

**Answer 1.** Of himself he could offer no satisfaction for the sin of the human race. Supposing he were ever so pure, he could, in strict justice, only answer for himself.

**2.** Yet it is equally certain that, in strict justice, the same nature which has sinned must give satisfaction for the sin.

3. Hence we see GOD's perfect mercy, as well as His perfect justice; for since man could not alone give Him satisfaction, He mercifully provided the way of redemption.

1st, CHRIST was in perfection a human being as well as a Divine One, He could, therefore, pay as man the Second Adam, a perfect obedience to His FATHER's will, and give that satisfaction which the first Adam had failed to do—thus vindicating GOD's honour in the creation of man, and proving that it was good both in the conception and execution. But 2ndly, as if He were only a human being, His obedience could only avail for Himself, and being also a Divine being, the SON of GOD, and one with GOD—the offering becomes dignified to an infinite satisfaction. “Human nature could not make this satisfaction in that it was weak through the flesh, therefore, says S. Paul, GOD sending His only SON in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, or by a sacrifice for sin (as our margin reads it,) condemned sin in the flesh. Rom. viii. 3.” *Leslie.*

Objection VIII. The vicarious sacrifice of CHRIST is made a transfer of guilt. “When the sufferings of one man are in any way the means of the impunity of another, it is usual to say the former was *punished* in the stead of the latter, though the former was *innocent* of the fault of the latter; and this is used without meaning to assert a *transfer of guilt*, or any reference to distributive justice.”

“So also, when the suffering of one man is the means in any way by which another is discharged from suffering, we usually call such sufferings vicarious, especially if the one submits to these sufferings *purposely*, to procure the release of the other; and this we do without meaning to affirm a mathematical equality in the degree of suffering and without meaning to specify the mode in which these sufferings *have their efficacy*.”

Ludlam, on Satisfaction, quoted in Wordsworth's Christian Institutes.

Objection IX. How could CHRIST's sufferings be punishments?

Answer. Though CHRIST be so far one with us, as to be liable to the penalty of the law, and to suffer it, and upon this suffering we are freed, yet CHRIST is not the sinner, nor the sinner CHRIST. It is true that we were so one with Him, that He *satisfied* for us, and the benefits of this satisfaction redound to us and are *communicable* to all upon certain terms, though not actually *communicated* to all. From this unity and identity of person in law, if I may so speak, it proves clearly, that CHRIST's sufferings were not only afflictions, but punishments in proper sense.

For it is not material whether He suffer for His own sins, which He could not, because He was innocent, or for the sins of others; for if He suffered for sins, then His sufferings were punishments. For *pœna* is *vindicta noxæ* sive *propriæ* sive *alienæ*. That one may suffer for the sins of others, and that justly, except we will accuse God of injustice, the Scriptures make evident by doctrines, threatenings, examples.

Objection X. Could not the ALMIGHTY without contravention to His own nature, have forgiven and restored man without the atoning sacrifice of CHRIST's death?

Answer. Supposing this could be the case, yet the ALMIGHTY might not deem it beneficial for man that his sin should be forgiven without placing before his mind such a monument of his offence as would demonstrate that He did not regard sin with complacency, but that His justice was as exact as His mercy was abundant.

God thought it not meet as He was the just and holy Ruler of the world to forgive sin without

teaching man what sin deserves, and making such a demonstration of His holiness and justice, as might serve as well to the aids of His government, as if the sinners had suffered themselves. Baxter, quoted in Wordsworth's *Christian Institutes*. Consult also Burnet on *Articles*.

*Explanation.*—To allow man to escape with impunity all imposed punishment for sin, and to subject him only to the restraint arising out of the natural consequences of vice, would be to impose a check, which we know would be practically insufficient to deter him from iniquity, and therefore would not be showing mercy towards him.

*Magee*, 124. That men could not have been forgiven, unless *CHRIST* had suffered to purchase their forgiveness, is no part of the doctrine of atonement, as held by the Church of England; what *God could* or *could not* have done, it presumes not to pronounce; what *God declares* He has done, that merely it asserts.

“When Grotius, Stillingfleet, and Clarke, are charged (as they are in H. Taylor's *B. Mord.*, Let. 5,) with contending for ‘the necessity of a vindication of God's honour, either by the suffering of the offenders, or by that of *CHRIST* in their room,’ they are by no means to be considered as contending that it was impossible for *God* to have established such a dispensation, as might enable *Him* to forgive the sinner without some satisfaction to *His* justice, which is the sense forcibly put upon their words.”

By the *necessity* spoken of, is meant but a *moral necessity*, or in other words a *fitness* and propriety, Dr. Clarke himself informs us; for he tells us, (Sermon 137, Vol. II., p. 142, fol. ed.,) that “when the honour of God's laws had been diminished by sin, it was *reasonable* and *necessary*, in respect of God's *wisdom in governing* the world, that there should be a *vindication*,” &c. And again, (Sermon 138, Vol. II. p. 150,) in answer to the question, “Could not *God*, if *He* had pleased, absolutely, and of *His* supreme authority, without any sufferings at all, have

pardoned the sins of those, whose repentance He thought fit to accept?" he says, "It becomes not us, to presume to say He had not power so to do;" but that there seems to be a *fitness*, in His testifying His indignation against sin, and that "the death of CHRIST was necessary to make the pardon of sin reconcileable, not perhaps absolutely with *strict justice*, (for we cannot presume to say that God might not, consistently with mere *justice*, have remitted as much of His own right as He pleased,) but it was *necessary*, at least in this respect, to make the pardon of sin consistent with the *wisdom* of God, in His good government of the world, and to be a *proper attestation* of His irreconcileable hatred against all unrighteousness."

Thus, Dr. Clarke, so far from considering the sacrifice of CHRIST as a *debt* paid to, because rigorously exacted by the Divine *justice*, represents it merely as a *fit* expedient, demanded by the *wisdom* of God, whereby mercy might be safely administered to man. *Magee.*

Objection XI. That "ransom," and "redemption," only mean "deliverance."

Answer. It is evident by the terms of "ransom," *λυτρόν*, S. Matt. xx. 28, and "price," *τιμή*, 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23; and "buying," *ἀγοράζειν*, 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23; 2 S. Pet. ii. 1; Acts xx. 28, attributed to the sacrifice of CHRIST, that the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven is assigned to Christians in consideration of the obedience and sufferings of CHRIST.

*Note.*—Archbp. Magee observed concerning some of the unitarian writings, that their system was "nothing more than an artificial accommodation of Scripture phrases to notions utterly repugnant to Scripture doctrine. In an assumed Scriptural strain, a writer in former days thus teaches us that "By the blood of CHRIST, God discharges us from the guilt, because the blood of CHRIST is the most powerful means of freeing us from the pollution and power of sin," and adds, "it is the ground of redemption, as it is a mean

of sanctification ;" but all these expressions only mean that "the blood of CHRIST is His perfect obedience and goodness," not a mere corporeal substance, which would be indeed of no more value than anything else of the same kind.

The same plan is adopted in recent works, while the language of Scripture is preserved, the only effort of the writers seems to be to explain away the natural force of the expressions employed.

"The Romans had sacrifices that they called *Lustralia*, and 'lustrare' signifies to 'expiate,' to wit, by paying a price. For Ennius, translating into Latin a Greek tragedy, 'Εὐρωπή Λέτρα, the subject, the ransoming of Hector's corpse, entitled it 'Hectoris Lustra;' therefore it is the Latin of Λέτρα. And Λέτρα signifies deliverance by paying a ransom. When the prophet says, Isa. xlii. 3, 'I have given Egypt for thy ransom, Cush and Seba instead of thee,' God signifieth by a parable, that having employed Sennacherib to execute His judgments upon those nations, He had given him the Egyptians and Ethiopians, that He might spare the Israelites. So He pays him his hire which discharges His own people of that which they would have otherwise suffered. So the Apostle saith, that CHRIST's death intercedes 'for the redemption of those transgressions, that remained under the Old Testament, Heb. ix. 15, and the Man CHRIST JESUS gave Himself a ransom to all,' 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. Also see S. Matt. xx. 28; S. Mark x. 45; and 1 Cor. vi. 20.

"These terms, it is not denied, sometimes signify by figure of speech mere deliverance, as when the judges and kings of Israel are said to redeem Israel, that is, to deliver him, without paying ransom for him. See Exod. xv. 13; Deut. vii. 8; ix. 26; S. Luke ii. 38, &c. Yet with such texts as, Be not slaves to men, because ransomed by CHRIST—By the blood of CHRIST ye are redeemed from your vain conversation, 1 Cor. vii. 23; 1 S. Pet. i. 18, 19, if the meaning were only to assure them that their deliverance will not fail them,

there could no cause be given them, why the purchase of it by way of ransom should be expressed ; which every man that goes to market, must needs understand to import the consideration in which we have it.”  
*Thorndike.*

---

## APPENDIX II.

## REFERRED TO AT Q. 535.

Derivation of the word “*justification*,” and the meaning of the term as applied to spiritual matters.

1. It was a legal term. To justify a person was “to do him justice in acquitting or condemning him for any cause, and more particularly so to do him right as to acquit him from guilt, (Deut. xxv. 1; Prov. xvii. 15.) Hence, by a mental judgment to approve him or esteem him just,” (S. Matt. xi. 19; S. Luke x. 29.) *Barrow.*

2. Bishop Andrewes thought that the forensic element in *justification* was its leading idea, “that a judicial justice was set before us.”

He alleges—The terms of 1. A judge, 1 Cor. iv. 4; 2. A prison, Gal. iii. 23; 3. A bar, 2 Cor. v. 10; 4. An accuser, Rev. xii. 10; 5. A conviction, that all may be *πωρόδικοι*, guilty before God, Rom. iii. 19. 6. The very delivering of our sins under the name of “debts,” of the law under the name of a “hand-writing,” S. Matt. vi. 12; Col. ii. 14, the very terms of “an advocate,” of “a surety,” “made under the law,” 1 S. John ii. 1; Gal. ii. 4, of “a pardon,” or “being justified from those things which by the law we could not,” Heb. vii. 22.

Next, consider the earliest applications of the term in a spiritual sense.

First, Abraham believed, and it was accounted (or imputed) unto him for righteousness, Gen. xv. 6.

*Note.*—Not the acts of faith referred to Heb. xi. 8, are pitched upon by the Apostle as justifying, but an act of pure faith without works. *Whitby.* The object of the Apostle being to elevate exclusively God's gracious and free gifts apart from man's merits. In Rom. iv. 17—23, this principle is alleged at length.

Secondly, S. Paul claims this principle of an *imputed righteousness*, also for a characteristic of the Christian religion. In Rom. iv. 2—25, he proves Abraham to be the father of "all them that believe," that righteousness might be imputed unto them also, and he interprets the passage, "Blessed is the man to whom the **LORD** will not impute sin," &c., as an imputation of righteousness *without works*, 6th v., and shows the reason, "It is of faith, that it might be by grace."

*Note.*—Waterland speaks of justification by faith as some particular, self-denying principle, by which good men, even under the patriarchal and legal dispensations, laid hold on the mercy of God, referring all not to their own deservings, but to Divine goodness in and through a Mediator.

Hence, in justification, thus viewed in the abstract, 1st, God on His part justifies by imputing righteousness, and 2ndly, Man is justified, *lays hold of justification* by faith, Rom. v. 1.

The next question is, Through what means justification is conferred by God.

1st, To Abraham and the Jew under the law, circumcision was a seal of justification already possessed, Rom. iv. 11, but under **CHRIST** baptism is the instrument of its conveyance.

*Note.*—By Waterland called "the immediate instrument of conveyance." (Rom. vi. 3—11, and especially the 6th v.) The death unto sin wrought in

baptism, justifies ; " he that is dead,"  $\delta\acute{e}dikal\omega\tauai$ , " is freed from" in the English version, but properly " has been justified from sin." Again, Tit. iii. 7, justification is here attributed to " the washing of regeneration," i.e., baptism. See preceding verses. " Saved," also answering to " justified." So " state of salvation."—Catechism. So justification frequently coupled with baptismal regeneration and absolution or remission of sins. Again, 1 Cor. vi. 11; Heb. x. 22, 23, 29; Eph. v. 25, 26.

Observe, English version not exact. " S. Paul says, not  $\delta\acute{e}kaios\mu\epsilon\tau\omega$ , being justified, but  $\delta\acute{e}kaios\theta\acute{e}\tau\epsilon\zeta$ , having been justified ; not  $\delta\acute{e}kaios\theta\acute{e}\tau\epsilon$ , ye are justified, but  $\acute{e}dikaios\theta\acute{e}\tau\epsilon$ , ye have been justified, viz., at some remarkable time. Rom. v. 1, 9; Tit. iii. 7." *Barrow.*

When then we are said to be " justified by faith alone," the expression does not imply that nothing but faith enters into the act or state of our justification, or that everything but faith is excluded from the office of justifying. Only any other instrument of reception or apprehension on man's part is shut out. This mode of expression was adopted to repress all attempts to establish man's righteousness, apart from God's special mercy and CHRIST's redeeming merits, and is equally available against the Pelagian and the Socinian, as the Romanist.

The Church of Rome asserts the doctrine of man's inherent righteousness, from a spiritual quality received into the soul, enduing it with power to bring forth good works, which inherent grace is capable of increase, and the soul becomes more and more consequently justified ; the augmentation whereof is merited by good works, as good works are made meritorious by it. *Hooker.* It is this doctrine of the merit of good works, which gave rise to the supererogatory works of the saints.

*Note.*—That the doctrine, that we are justified by faith alone without works as held by the Lutheran, is

entirely different from that of the Church of England ; and is not declared to be " that lively faith which is discerned by its fruit." The proof of the faith of the Lutherans being justifying is personal assurance of it, giving them assurance of their acceptableness before God.

Luther invented the doctrine to oppose the corruptions of the Church of Rome, but fell into error by going beyond the revealed Word. Melancthon explained his leader's doctrine as *fides figurata*.

Besides faith, then, it is very plain that other operations must contribute to our justification.

1st, GOD the FATHER justifies us as the origin of our justification. Eph. i. 3—7 ; 2 Cor. i. 18—21.

2ndly, GOD the SON justifies us as the meritorious Cause, (Rom. iv. 25,) Who was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification.

" CHRIST JESUS, Who of GOD is made unto us wisdom, and justification, and sanctification, and redemption." 1 Cor. i. 30.

" This is the Name whereby they shall call Him, the LORD our Righteousness." Jer. xxiii. 6.

" By Whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand," (Rom. v. 2,) " justified by His blood, &c." Rom. v. 9, 10.

3rdly, GOD the HOLY GHOST, as the sanctifying Cause, (1 Cor. vi. 11; 2 Thess. ii. 13; Rom. v. 5; viii. 10, 15; Eph. i. 13.)

4thly, The act of our justification is conveyed to us by baptism as we have already seen.

5thly, Works have their part also in our justification, as it is plain from S. James' words, " Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac ?" S. James ii. 21, 24, which Waterland explains thus, " S. James in the *conditional* sense makes justification to depend equally upon faith and good works, being equally conditions and equally indispensable,

where opportunities permit. The faith called here a condition is of much wider compass, than that particular kind of faith which is precisely the instrument of justification."

*Note.*—In the case of infants, good works are not conditions; neither faith nor good works being required by them.

Although these "good works cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment, i.e., be grounds of justification, yet they are necessary fruits of a lively faith, as in Art. XII., and being done under the grace of CHRIST, and by the inspiration of His Spirit, (Art. XIII.) are pleasing and acceptable to God in CHRIST."

6thly, There is also plainly an imparted as well as an imputed righteousness.

So Bishop Andrewes, "that both these then are there is no question." Barrow allows that there are four places in which "justifying" may signify an internal operation upon the soul of man. Both are, however, it should be confessed, great upholders of the doctrine of forensic justification.

By the indwelling of CHRIST JESUS through the HOLY SPIRIT, 1 Cor. vi. 19, we are enabled to do good works, and while for His sake we are accounted holy, by His grace working within us, we are actually made by the same Divine presence, more and more righteous before God. (Rom. v. 17; Rom. viii. 1, 4, 9—11, 15, 16, 30; Tit. iii. 6, 7; 2 Cor. vi. 16.)

Compare Title of Art. XIII., with a portion of its context. Works done before justification is explained as "Works done before the *grace of CHRIST and the inspiration of His Spirit.*" Again, note that in the Baptismal Office the child receives "remission of his sins," by which justification is implied "by spiritual regeneration," i.e., the gift of the Spirit. Again, the Homilies on "who rose again for our justification,"

say, "CHRIST rose again to send down His HOLY SPIRIT, to rule in our hearts, to endow us with perfect righteousness," &c.

Hom. of Salv. "No man by his own acts, word, or deeds, (seem they never so good,) can be justified and made righteous before God; but every man of necessity is constrained to seek for another righteousness, and justification to be received . . . of God's mercy and CHRIST's merits, and allowed of God for our perfect and full justification. Faith doth not shut out repentance, love, and the fear of God to be joined with faith in every man that is justified; but it shutteth them out from the office of justifying. Neither doth faith shut out the justice of our good works necessarily to be done afterwards of duty towards God; but it excludeth them, so that we may not do them to this intent, to be made just by doing of them . . . So that in CHRIST, and by Him, every true Christian man may be called *a fulfiller of the law.*"

END OF PART II.,  
ON THE CREED.

"These little works appear to have been compiled with great care. They enter into the wants of the little ones of the flock, and we are grateful to find one competent to the task, devoting his energies to the simplifying of Divine truth."—*Clerical Journal.*

A GRADUATED  
**SERIES OF CATECHISMS**  
BY THE  
**REV. HENRY STRETTON, M.A.,**  
PRINCIPAL OF THE ENGLISH AND FOREIGN COLLEGE, HIGHGATE.

---

1.

**THE CHILD'S CATECHISM.**

Price 1d.

"For the use of children between the ages of five and seven years. An introduction to the Church Catechism."—*Bibliotheca Probata, by Dr. Schroeder.*

---

2.

**A CATECHISM OF FIRST TRUTHS OF  
CHRISTIANITY.**

**Introductory to the Church Catechism.**

Price 1d.

"A summary of the doctrines of the Gospel, with scriptural explanations. This little book is arranged with extraordinary skill, and possesses rare excellence."—*Dr. Schroeder.*

**THE CHURCH CATECHISM EXPLAINED AND  
ANNOTATED,**

**PRINCIPALLY AS AN AID TO THE CLERGY**

**IN**

**Catechising in Churches.**

**PART I.**

Price 1s., cloth; interleaved, 1s. 6d.

**INTRODUCTION. CONFIRMATION. BAPTISMAL PRIVILEGES  
AND VOW.**

**PART II.**

**ON THE CREED.**

**Parts III. IV., in preparation.**

**ON THE COMMANDMENTS. LORD'S PRAYER, AND SACRAMENTS.**

**"For the use of those who regard catechising as an ordinance  
and portion of Divine Service. Sound and thorough."—Dr.  
Schroeder.**

**THE CHURCH CATECHISM EXPLAINED,**

**FOR THE**

**Use of Young Persons.**

**PART I.**

**ABRIDGED FROM THE ABOVE.**

Price 2d.

**"For use in families and schools, as well as in parishes. One  
of the best books of its class."—Dr. Schroeder.**

**Part II. in immediate preparation.**

## 5.

**THE SCHOLAR'S MANUAL OF DEVOTIONS  
AND SACRED FORMULARIES,**

INCLUDING

**THE CHURCH CATECHISM, THE LITTLE PSALTER, ETC.**

Price 2d., or in cloth, 4d.

"This little collection aims at giving in a small compass, those devotional exercises which a Parent or Tutor might desire to engage a child 'in committing unto perfect memory.'"

## 6.

**STRETTON'S CATECHISMS**, consisting of 1, 2, 4, 5, in one small vol., cloth, 1s.

## 7.

**A BRIEF CATECHISM OF SCRIPTURE HISTORY.**

Price 6d., or in cloth 8d.

"One principal aim of its Author has been to draw forth, as being likely to interest children and young persons, the most striking passages in the Bible History in a connected form, and to preserve as nearly as possible in so doing the felicitous diction of Scripture in its colloquial, descriptive and narrative passages."  
—*Preface.*

## 8.

**THE COLLECTS EXPLAINED IN A CATECHETICAL FORM.**

Parts I., 4d., and II., 6d.

It is hoped to furnish Christian Children in the above Catechisms with all such fundamental instruction in our holy Religion as may be necessary to them. Nothing would appear to be more wanting in the Education of young Persons than a Series of sound Catechetical Works, arranged on a system, and expressly with a view to direct the thoughts of the learner, constantly to the most necessary things."—*Preface to Child's Catechism.*

*Also, by the same Author,*

Price 7s. 6d.

**THE ACTS OF S. MARY MAGDALENE  
CONSIDERED IN SIXTEEN SERMONS.**

“A series of discourses of unusual interest, combining much sound argument with much practical and devotional exhortation.”—*English Review.*

---

Price 1s. With a reduction on numbers.

**CHURCH HYMNS,**

FOR THE

**Sundays, Festivals, and other Seasons of the Ecclesiastical Year.**

COMPILED, WITH AN INTRODUCTION, BY  
THE REV. H. STRETTON, M.A.

“This work has the rare merit of conforming to the manner and the spirit of the Church in her services and offices.”—*Dr. Schroeder.*

“Of the versification of the Church Hymns and the taste displayed in their selection, we must speak in terms of the highest commendation.”—*Ecclesiastic.*

---

Price 5s. 6d.

**GUIDE TO THE INFIRM, SICK, AND DYING.**

“Carefully and judiciously written, following out the directions of the Church formularies in a style borrowed from our elder divines, and enriched by copious examples and extracts drawn from their pages.”—*English Review.*

**LONDON: JOSEPH MASTERS, ALDERSGATE STREET,  
AND NEW BOND STREET.**







